

DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91125

BARZIZZA'S STUDIES OF CICERO

G. W. Pigman III



HUMANITIES WORKING PAPER 55

December 1980

Abstract for Barzizza's Studies of Cicero

Before Barzizza's claim to be the father of Ciceronianism can be fruitfully discussed we must know more about his own work with Cicero. This paper offers a first contribution to such a reexamination by calling attention to three little known works: 1) his commentary on figures of speech and thought from the Ad Herennium, 2) his 1420 lectures on the speeches, 3) his biography of Cicero. The paper also prunes Barzizza's bibliography of several commentaries which he is recently supposed to have written and which under analysis prove to be ghosts. The main part of the paper discusses the life of Cicero (which is here edited for the first time), in particular its relation to its sources.

Barzizza's Studies of Cicero

Even in his own day Barzizza was known for his work with Cicero, especially for his part in disseminating the Lodi manuscript of the rhetorical works. In a famous letter which captures the enthusiasm of that discovery and remains an impressive tribute to Barzizza even when one remembers that the writer is requesting a favor and thus wishes to make his correspondent "benevolentem" Guarino says:

Gratulati sumus et laudi et sapientiae tuae quem ab diis manibus vel verius Elysiis campis renascens ad superos Cicero primum in terris delegit hospitem; quod re quoque ipsa augurari licuerat. Quem enim potius quam te Cicero ipse deligeret, cuius ductu atque auspiciis amatur legitur et per Italorum gymnasia summa cum gloria volitat?¹

Another extravagant commendation of Barzizza's service and devotion to Cicero appears in the inaugural lecture which Antonio da Rho delivered in Milan after assuming the chair of rhetoric which Barzizza occupied towards the end of his life. Antonio lists several contemporaries worthy of imitation and mentions Barzizza last:

tamen abolitum exactissimae cum eloquentiae tum doctrinae virum, Gasparinum Pergamensem, qui, ut aiunt, Ciceronem ipsum ita menti, ita memoriae commendarat, ut vel extinctum ipse ex integro illum suscitare et in lucem afferre quidem potuisset.²

The brief references to Barzizza in Flavio Biondo's Italia illustrata

and Marcantonio Sabellico's De latinae linguae reparatione focus on his involvement with the Lodi manuscript.³

Modern scholarship still associates Barzizza with Cicero. Ever since Sabbadini dubbed him "il vero apostolo del ciceronianismo," a reference to Barzizza and Ciceronianism has become de rigueur. Sabbadini was careful to point out that he did not know what principle of imitation Barzizza espoused, but deduced from a sentence in De compositione that he allowed "una certa libertà." He went on to show that Barzizza's own style, especially in the familiar letters, did not smack of Ciceronian purism. He knew what some later writers seem to have forgotten—that Barzizza is not the model for Erasmus' Nosoponus.⁴

I do not wish to reconsider the question of Barzizza's place in the history of Ciceronianism except to make two brief observations. First, in his treatise on imitation Barzizza once erects Cicero as sole model ("Qui vult imitari Ciceronem non relinquat"), often mentions Cicero as one model among others, and sometimes seems to prefer Cicero without excluding other models. My sense is that Barzizza thinks Cicero most deserving of imitation, but does not wish to restrict imitation to Cicero alone. In any event the lack of consistency shows that Barzizza had not adopted a rigid Ciceronian position.⁵ Second, in a letter of uncertain date and recipient Barzizza defends the eclecticism of his studies:

Proponas tibi hominem qui se optet bonum esse artificem, sed pauperrimum, qui prorsus careat instrumentis ad illam ipsam artem necessariis: quid tunc proderit ei ars? Certe nihil. Itidem

mihi: quid mihi prodesset Cicero sine Prisciano et Terentio et ceteris poetis? Quid Priscianus sine Cicerone et Terentio? Quid denique Terentius sine Cicerone et Prisciano? Sane nihil. Quare non tunc est occupatus sensus circa plura, quia diversa, quando ea sunt unum.⁶

This is not the statement of a strict Ciceronian.

Before someone can undertake a reassessment of Ciceronianism and Barzizza's place in it, we need to know more about Barzizza's studies of Cicero. At present we know quite a bit about his work on De oratore, but very little about anything else.⁷ Before turning to Barzizza's Vita Marci Tulli Ciceronis, I would like to say a few words about commentaries recently attributed to Barzizza which I believe he never wrote, his commentary on Ad Herennium 4.19-68, and his 1420 lectures on Cicero's orations.

I

In the most comprehensive study of Barzizza yet to appear R. G. G. Mercer assigns ten commentaries to his subject.⁸ Among them are commentaries on Cicero's De amicitia and De senectute, preserved in Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, V C 11, ff. 23r-4lv. Nowhere in his correspondence does Barzizza mention that he is commenting on these two works, although he does request copies of older commentaries on them while he is trying to obtain another on De officiis from Enrico Veronese (Opera, pp. 190-191). More significantly the commentaries are not attributed to Barzizza in the manuscript, although the prefixed parchment title page is misleading:⁹

Synonima Cicer. orthograph.

Gasparini Comm. in Cicer. de Amicitia
et senectute.

Nonius Marcellus.

On first glance it might appear that the commentaries are attributed to Barzizza, but actually "Gasparini" goes with "orthograph." Whoever wrote the title page was taking this piece of information from f. 2lv, "Explicit orthographia M. gasparini cum punctis." In fact ff. 19r-2lv do contain part of Barzizza's De punctis, although not a recognized version of the Orthographia but a series of lines beginning, "Sensus huius versus talis est." Three quarters of f. 2lv and all of 22rv are blank. The commentary on De amicitia begins on f. 23r (the first page of a new signature) without title or indication of author:

Circa hunc autorem vij sunt considerata intentio auctoris
utilitas operis ad quem scribat qua de causa scribat quo genere
sermonis utatur cui parti philosophie supponatur quis sit libri
titulus.

The commentary is written in double columns and ends halfway down the first on f. 32r:

In fine autem vos hortor ut virtute sine qua amicitia non est
nihil prestabilius existimetis.

At the top of the first column of f. 32v the scribe began to recopy the accessus to De amicitia, caught his error, left most of the column blank, and began the commentary on De senectute at the top of the next column:

Duas etates esse legimus quas distinguntur per quedam attributa

commendabilia et quedam vituperalia scilicet iuventutem et senectutem.

It ends near the top of the first column of f. 4lv:

Hec habui [De senectute 86] accipit commeatum quia finem operis positurus.

Complectum die sabati 3⁰ mensis octobr. 1450 per iohannem de vernonaria vincentie.¹⁰

The last line disposes of Mercer's conjecture that the commentaries "were most probably in Barzizza's hand" (p. 85). Nothing in them points to Barzizza's authorship.

Mercer (p. 81) also assigns commentaries on De oratore, Epistolae ad familiares, and the Philippics to Barzizza. Since the only evidence for these commentaries is in Mazzuchelli and Simler--Barzizza never refers to them in his correspondence--I remain highly sceptical that they ever existed. Other commentaries certainly never existed, not even in intention. Mercer creates one on Seneca's tragedies out of a sentence from a letter by Barzizza to his son Niccolò, who had written that he was continuing to lecture on Terence and about to begin on Valerius Maximus: "Deinde a me requiris commentarios in tragoedias Senecae ac ipsas tragoedias; ais enim te sollicitari a quibusdam ut sententias illarum eis exponas."¹¹ Barzizza does not even add "meos" to "commentarios," as he does in a letter requesting the return of his commentary on Terence (Opera, p. 199). "Meos" leads Mercer to assign such a work to Barzizza, even though he admits it might indicate possession, not authorship. Since no other reference to a commentary on Terence exists, as opposed to the

excerpts from Plautus and Terence which Sabbadini identified long ago,¹² this is very slender evidence for positing another commentary by Barzizza.

The surest ghost in Mercer's list is a commentary on Pliny (pp. 72, 82). While trying to obtain a copy of the Natural History Barzizza writes to Giovanni Cornaro:

Non poterit quin ex cumulo rerum quas dignissimus is auctor
complexus fuit libris 36, multa possim elicere quae
commentariolis meis commodissime inserantur. (Bertalot, II 95)

Likewise when asking Facino Ventraria to help obtain Pliny:

Sed adeo pernecessarius est sententiis summorum virorum a me
commentandis, ut nullo modo videar posse negotium istud
conficere, nisi ea quae pluribus locis ab hoc homine conscripta
fuerunt, commentariis meis inseruero. (Bertalot, II 96)

Barzizza says nothing about composing a commentary on Pliny; he wants the Natural History for another commentary--on Valerius Maximus as Cesare Colombo has convincingly shown.¹³ Colombo believes that Barzizza did not write a formal commentary on Valerius Maximus comparable to the one on Seneca's letters; instead the commentary consists of glosses in one of Barzizza's copies of Valerius, Vatican City, Vat. lat. 7229. No manuscript of a formal commentary survives.¹⁴ The evidence for a commentary on Dante is again very slight. Around 1411 Barzizza expresses a hope he will lecture on Dante (Bertalot, II 61), and after moving to Milan he asks Guiniforte about a copy of Dante "manibus ac digitis meis glossato" (II 88). In a letter probably around 1412¹⁵ saying that he has been unable to

return to work on De officiis he writes, "Suscipiam etiam animo libenti onus commentariorum Dantis, si rescripseris quid a me velis fieri" (Bertalot, II 94). Since there are no further references to this offer, the safest assumption is that Barzizza never wrote a commentary although he must have studied Dante closely as his glossed manuscript suggests. In brief, of Mercer's ten commentaries only the one on Seneca's Epistolae morales survives¹⁶; Barzizza refers very frequently to a commentary on De officiis, but, as I shall try to show later on, there are strong grounds to suspect that he did not complete it. The evidence for all the others, with the possible exception of one on Valerius, is so weak that in the absence of new information the safest assumption is that Barzizza never wrote them and did not even seriously intend to write them.

II

Mercer and Daniela Mazzuconi briefly drew attention to Barzizza's commentary on Ad Herennium 4.19-68, the section on figures of speech and thought.¹⁷ Two of the manuscripts which contain it, Oxford, Balliol College 132, ff. 60v-87r (B), and Venice, Marc. lat. XIV 68 (4735), ff. 77r-112r (M), transmit it without title or attribution. The third, Vatican City, Ott. lat. 1438, ff. 108r-116v (O), is entitled, "Exornaciones colorum et sententiarum Gasparini pergamensis rethorici eximij."

The work is very systematically organized, and the plan sketched in the prologue, which I reproduce in Appendix I, is followed religiously. For each of the figures of speech or thought Barzizza gives a Greek name, goes through seven rhetorical categories from the

Ad Herennium and the parts of a letter to show which categories or parts are most appropriate for the "exornatio" under discussion. As usual for writers on rhetoric in general and for Barzizza especially, decorum is the guiding principle.¹⁸ And in fact his comment at the end of the prologue that all rules must give way to the circumstances of the occasion redeems some of the systematic ruthlessness, even tedium, of the presentation. It is such refreshing good sense and so typical of Barzizza's humility to prefix a caveat against "superstitio praeceptorum" to a long list of rules.

The seven categories which Barzizza applies from the Ad Herennium can be briefly passed over with a reference to the passage from that work which provides the terminology: 1) "genera causarum," which branch of rhetoric (1.2), 2) "partes orationis," (1.4), 3) "genera accidentalis," (= "genera causarum," "honestum," etc. 1.5) 4) "constitutiones" (1.18), 5) "partes argumentationis," (2.28, cf. 3.16 for slightly different terminology) 6) "figura," kind of style, not figure of speech, (4.11), 8) "pronuntiatio," (3.19-27).

The final category, the parts of a letter, is not quite so straightforward because Barzizza does not have terms provided by his text, does not cite any dictaminal authorities,¹⁹ and does not discuss in any one passage how many parts a letter has. The first figure of speech receives the fullest treatment, and when Barzizza comes to his ninth category, he says:

Postremus locus fuit de partibus epistolae. Placet itaque repetitionem non incommode tractari in exordio, narratione, amplificatione narrationis sive confirmatione, in petitione, in

ratione sive confirmatione petitionis, et in extrema conclusione, maxime cum epistola pertinet ad aliquam singularem et egregiam vituperationis aut laudis rationem. (B, f. 62r, which omits "in petitione...confirmatione"; M, f. 78v; O, f. 108r)

On the basis of this passage it appears that Barzizza considers a letter to have seven parts; he adds "amplificatio narrationis" ("confirmatio") and "confirmatio petitionis" ("ratio") to the usual five parts.²⁰ Several times when discussing other figures "confirmatio narrationis" and "confirmatio petitionis" are mentioned as parts of the letter. "Salutatio" does not appear here because, as Barzizza says a bit later:

De salutatione vero [om. O] nulla quasi a me habita mentio est in hoc tractatu exornationum cum idem sentiam de salutatione quod me superius notasse de divisione memini, tam enim salutatio in epistola quam diviso in oratione raro vel nunquam exornationem desiderat, nisi fortasse eo salutationum genere uteremur quo nimis ambitiose utuntur quidam viri religiosi quibus ideo ignoscendum arbitror quod quis eis melius [melius eis O] sacrarum litterarum peritiam quam eloquentiae concesserit [B concessit].

(B, f. 66r; M, ff. 83v-84r; O, f. 109v)

In addition to listing the appropriate parts of a letter Barzizza gives the "materia epistolaris" most suited to the figure. For example, one can best use the first three figures, "repetitio," "conversio," and "complexio" when one is trying to praise or vilify, or "ratiocinatio" and "diffinitio" when trying to persuade or dissuade the correspondent.

III

In 1438 Giovanni Tremonti recalled hearing Barzizza lecture at Padua in 1420 on Cicero's speeches, but did not give any details of the instruction.²¹ Another member of that audience, Lorenzo Bonsi, recorded his notes on fifteen of the speeches; they are preserved as "argumenta" in Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale V B 35, ff. 110r-118r, as one learns from the "explicit":²²

Expliciunt quedam utilissima argumenta super .xv. orationibus marci .T. ciceronis declarantia locos tocius artis ipsarum orationum per clarissimum virum laurentium bontium breviter collecta ex dictis Gasparini pergamensis viri eloquentissimi dum easdem orationes padue legeret anno domini nostri yesus christi m cccc^o xx^o.

For over ten years Barzizza had owned Antonio Loschi's Inquisitio artis in orationibus Ciceronis, which provides the model for the type of comment which Barzizza made on the speeches, even though he once or twice disagrees with Loschi and never names him.²³ The Argumenta concern only two of the speeches which Loschi discussed, Pro lege manilia and Pro Milone, and these are two of the speeches which receive the most detailed comment by Barzizza. Ten of the speeches had been briefly provided with historical introductions by Sicco Polenton in 1413 in Argumenta super aliquot orationibus et invectivis Ciceronis, which Barzizza seems to have known: Pro Balbo, Post reditum in senatu, Post reditum ad populum, De haruspicum responso, De provinciis consularibus, In Vatinius, Pro Caelio, De domo sua, Pro Sestio, and the pseudo-Ciceronian Oratio pridie quam in

exilium iret. The other three speeches were discovered by Poggio during the council of Constance: In Pisonem, and De lege agraria I and II.

Loschi's preface to the Inquisitio lays out the six categories which he will follow for each speech: 1) a summary with background ("argumentum"), 2) the branch of rhetoric ("genus causae"), 3) the type of issue ("natura status sive constitutionis"), 4) the order and number of parts to the speech ("dispositio"), 5) a discussion of each part with particular attention to the commonplaces and argumentation of the "confirmatio" and "confutatio," 6) style ("elocutio"), which ends up being a list of figures of speech and thought ("colores").²⁴ Loschi, writing a commentary, rigorously follows this plan, which requires that he treat each category separately and thus retrace his steps in 5 and return to the very beginning of the speech when he lists the figures. Several of Barzizza's Argumenta, in their existing form, do not cover every one of these categories, but one suspects that the lectures themselves followed the full scheme. Barzizza, however, usually goes through the speech from beginning to end, treating the last three categories as they appear.

For an example I shall take Barzizza's discussion of De haruspicum responso (ff. 115r-116r). The speech belongs to deliberative oratory because Cicero is addressing the senate; also one can see it is deliberative if one closely examines what Cicero is trying to do. Defining the issue as "legitima" offers an opportunity to sketch the background of Clodius' attempt to prevent Cicero from regaining his house. The arrangement of the parts of the speech does

not follow the rules of art but is accommodated to the occasion with the early insertion of the "confutatio." Memory and delivery are not to be considered because they apply only to viva voce presentation. The style is particularly brilliant as one can see by closely examining the "colores." The exordium is "in genere dubio." The following passage is easier to quote than to summarize:²⁵

Captat benevolenciam primo a persona sua cum incipit dicere, "Hesterno die, patres conscripti, cum me" (1), et ab auditoribus [et autoribus] ibi, "et nostra dignitas" (1: vestra) deinde ab adversario, scilicet Clodio, ibi, "Itaque hominem furem" (1), item ab adversario ibi, "Sed vecors" (2). Deinde confirmat premittens confirmationi aliam propositionem que incipit ibi, "Sed quoniam de his omnibus" (40), confirmatio ibi, "Movent per optimum" (40: Monent ne per optimatum), demum concludit per amplificatum ibi conclusio, "Quare, id quod extremum est" (60). "Tum inquam" (4), conduplicatio. "Pecudem" (5), translatio. "Qui lapidibus" (6), repetitio. "De religionibus" (8), narratio confutationis causa. "Responsum" (9), accedit ad causam principalem. "Sed tamen" (11: Sed quae tandem), confutatio propositionis predictae. "Autoritati" (14), articulus. "Nulla publica" (16: Nego ullo de opere publico?), id est, in campo marcio. "Sed quoniam mea" (18), secunda pars principalis confutationis, qua prosequitur Cicero arguens primo a partibus prudentie refutandis. "Vt satis superque" (18). Hunc locum imitatus est Valerius in principio capituli de religione (1.1.1) cum dixit, "Maiores scatas solempnesque ceremonias," exponendo

"listatas" pro "scatuas," ut dicit hic Cicero, quod contra opinionem Benvenuti commentarijs suis in Valerium dicentis quod "li scatus" non debet aliter exponi nisi prout littera sonat, quod homo alioquin doctissimus fortasse non dixisset si hanc orationem vidisset. (f. 115v)

The reference to Benvenuto da Imola's commentary on Valerius Maximus is atypical of the Argumenta, which rarely mention anyone by name, but the alternate identification of parts of the speech and figures constitutes the body of all of them. In fact Barzizza continues in this vein for a few more lines with De haruspicum responso.

The 1420 lectures, it is thus fair to assume, follow the type of rhetorical commentary which Loschi made popular at the end of the preceding century. In other words categories from the Ad Herennium, supposedly Cicero's own theoretical basis for his speeches, become the tools for analyzing his oratorical practice. One sees the same classificatory impulse in the commentary on figures of speech and thought, and in fact Barzizza's lectures and commentary are two sides of the same coin. In one he shows which part of rhetoric, which type of issue, which part of a speech are appropriate to a certain figure; in the other he identifies these various parts and the figures themselves.

IV

Barzizza's life of Cicero has received almost no attention.²⁶ He wrote it as an introduction to a series of lectures or a commentary on De officiis, just as he wrote a life of Seneca to serve as an introduction to his commentary on Seneca's letters. As in his life of

Seneca, Barzizza devotes most of his energy to the death scene, and this marks a major departure from his primary source, Bruni's Cicero novus. The other distinguishing features of Barzizza's biography are the relative lack of concern with Cicero's political career and the calm conviction that Cicero led a life beyond reproach.

At the end of his August 1815 dedication of the Cicero novus to Niccoli, Bruni challenges all the learned to write a better biography.²⁷ Not many years later Barzizza produced his own, not in competition with Bruni, but in close dependence on him. The date of composition must fall between the discovery of Asconius by Poggio and others at St. Gall in the summer of 1416 and the discovery of the Lodi manuscript of Cicero's Rhetorica in the second half of 1421. When mentioning that a number of Cicero's speeches are lost, Barzizza cites Asconius for the opinion that Cicero never lost a case except for his defense of Milo:

Innumerabiles paene alias editas a se esse orationes constans opinio est, quarum ne quidem nomina quadam sive fati iniquitate sive neglencia hominum atque inertia ad nos pervenerunt, quibus omnibus illum semper superiorem discessisse, nec ulla unquam in causa subcubuisse excepta Miloniana, ut Asconius tradit. (54.2-6)

Unfortunately Asconius and pseudo-Asconius never make any such claim. It seems that Barzizza is misinterpreting the following passage from the end of Asconius' "argumentum" to the Pro Milone:

Cicero cum inciperet dicere, exceptus acclamatione Clodianorum, qui se continere ne metu quidem circumstantium militum potuerunt. Itaque non ea qua solitus erat constantia dixit.²⁸

Barzizza may have taken this unusual lapse in "constantia" to imply a unique failure to win a case.²⁹

Barzizza's correspondence provides no indication when he obtained a copy of Asconius. The liberation, as Cencio Rustici calls it, of Asconius from the monastery at St. Gall took place in the summer of 1416, probably in July. The copy (Florence, Laur. Plut. 54.5) belonging to Bartolomeo da Montepulciano, the third liberator along with Poggio and Cencio, bears the date 25 July 1416.³⁰ Barzizza was at Constance just three days after the discovery, and a later letter from Poggio to Francesco Barbaro suggests a certain degree of intimacy between Barzizza and Poggio.³¹ It is thus safe to conjecture that Barzizza knew of the discovery almost at once. He did not obtain, however, a copy of the complete Quintilian, discovered at the same time as Asconius, until the following March.³² One can be fairly sure that Barzizza had Asconius by 11 December 1419, the date of a letter from Guarino to Girolamo Gualdo requesting a copy (Epistolario I 284).

Barzizza must have finished his biography before the discovery of Cicero's Brutus, which he does not mention in the list of rhetorical works. It is inconceivable that Barzizza, who emphasizes Cicero's writings at the expense of his political career and had a hand in making the Brutus known to the world, would not refer to it. In a later edition of his Orthographia he proudly declares his ownership of the Lodi manuscript, "ubi tres expleti De oratore libri ad Q. f., item Orator ad Brutum et alius qui Brutus dicitur continetur."³³

A few phrases in the biography suggest that Barzizza delivered it as a lecture in a course on De officiis. At 56.11-13 he says that if he went into as much detail as Plutarch and Plutarch's imitators, "tardius quam optatis ad rem ipsam accessus esset." At 58.16-18 he uses another expression more appropriate to spoken delivery, "Dies me deficeret, si omnes vel ingenii vel virtutis eius laudes prosequi verbis vellem"; and "dies me deficeret" appears in his prologue to Aristotles' De anima (Opera, p. 43). At 64.18-19 he comes to the time Cicero wrote De officiis, "quos in praesentia commentandos in manus sumpsimus." This clause clarifies the earlier reference to this work, which Barzizza in one of his rare departures from the order in which Bruni lists Cicero's writings, mentions last of the philosophical works: "hos tres de officiis" (55.21-22). It seems unlikely that Barzizza would postpone the information that he is introducing a commentary on De officiis, unless everyone knew that was the subject of his course. All of these indications of oral delivery by no means imply that Barzizza could not have intended to reuse the life as an introduction to a written commentary, but would help to explain why the life is transmitted separately from the commentary, which has not survived and, perhaps, was never completed or published.

Although Barzizza's correspondence is full of his plans to write a commentary and of his attempt to obtain an older one on the same work from Enrico Veronese, the only evidence that he wrote the commentary is contained in an entry of a later edition of the Orthographia. When discussing hemiciclus, he quotes De officiis 2.87 and remarks, "De quo latius in commentariolis Officiorum scribimus."³⁴

The tense may be significant; Barzizza may only mean to say that he is at work on the commentary. This note appears in an edition of the Orthographia after the discovery of the Lodi manuscript, in which edition, as mentioned previously, Barzizza calls the manuscript his own. It does not appear in one of the earlier editions, whose entry under hemiciclus differs on the spelling and does not refer to the commentary: "Hemicyclus per secundum i grecum; est cathedra vel locus ad formam semicirculi ubi nobiles et sapientes sedebant."³⁵ This edition is later than 1416 because it mentions, f. 168r, the recent discovery of Quintilian in Germany. Thus one assumes that Barzizza is at work on his commentary after 1422.

1422, however, seems rather late for Barzizza to return to work because all of his references to his plans are a decade earlier. Some ten letters from 1411-12 deal with his attempts to obtain through the agency of Antonio Fantascello an older commentary on De officiis in the possession of Enrico Veronese or to receive support for the work from count Lodovico Sambonifacio or the Marchese of Ferrara, Niccolò d'Este. Sometime shortly after the election of Marino Caravello as procurator of San Marco on 16 November 1410 Fantascello informs Barzizza that Enrico had "quoddam opus morale."³⁶ In letters dated 23 March (of the next year) Barzizza thanks Fantascello and requests the commentary from Enrico. To the latter he explains that he is resuming work on his own commentary after yielding to his friends' desire to write on Seneca's letters (Opera, pp. 136-137). A few months later in a letter to Sambonifacio dated 13 June, he says he cannot send him the commentary because he never finished it; he

laments the decline of studies, especially the rewards they receive, and continues:

Non habeo quomodo possim huic tuo desiderio satisfacere, nisi tu forte aliquid in re mea prospicis, quailter me possis aut per te ipsum aut per tuos iuvare apud illum magnificum principem tuum, qui more maiorum suorum aliquam mihi viam aperiat ad bene de se sperandum. (Bertalot, II 93)

Five days later Barzizza writes Fantascello that he needs the commentary more than ever: "sum enim hortatu magnifici principis marchionis Ferrariae commentarios meos perfecturus" (Opera, p. 190). He also requests, the only time in the correspondence, commentaries on De amicitia and De senectute. Some obstacles to Barzizza's work still remain (one of them no doubt his inability to secure Enrico's commentary), for not long afterward, 17 August, Barzizza sends the following unpublished letter to Sambonifacio:

Gasparinus pergamensis plurimam dicit salutem Lodovico Bonifacio comiti Verone. Posteaquam ad te scripsi, neque tempus neque facilitatem mihi adesse ad persequendum comentarios offitiorum quos satis cupide a me exoptaveras. Non cessam cogitare qualiter huic tuo desiderio possem satisfacere, sed quia res ista non potest comode inter absentes agi, constitui ad te navigare his proximis diebus et deliberationem meam tibi aperire. Si quis exitus consiliis meis inveniri poterit, video rem in vado nec defuturum otium mihi ad hec studia que tibi et huius generis literarum cupidis possint placere. Si vero cogitationes mee et auxilia amicorum non habuerint illam fortunam quam volumus, non

possum tamen frustra ad te venisse. Fruar enim tuo conspectu et illud exiguum quod amicitie deerat cumulatissime perficiam ut sicut summa inter nos animo familiaritas ac benivolentia contracta erat, ita illam contemplandam oculis nostris aliquando subiciam. Vale. Patavij xvj^o kalendas septembras. (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Can. Misc. 101, ff. 256v-257r.)

The efforts to obtain Enrico's commentary continue. Barzizza tells Fantascello, probably 7 December,³⁷ to pay Enrico ("ille noster, ut tu appellare soles, Tiresias") what he wants; he'll put up with the price just as he has put up with an abusive letter from Enrico (Opera, p. 139). Probably around this time Barzizza begins to suspect that Fantascello is not doing his best to obtain the work; a brief, undated letter threatens him with loss of Barzizza's good opinion if he does not produce it soon (p. 192). 8 April 1412 Barzizza delivers his ultimate to Fantascello, as he sends Facino Bergamasco for the commentary: "Committes autem ipsi commentarios illos toties a me petitos, nisi forte vis finem facere tot officiis quot his annis inter nos fuerunt" (p. 138). This blast seems to have produced the desired result, for sometime in September Barzizza writes an unidentified correspondent:

Commentarios vero in officia Ciceronis apud me habebam ceperamque intermissum opus illud repetere. Sed alia nescio quae causa me inde retraxit et tempus illud, quod ad eam ipsam rem accommodaveram, nolente me de manibus extorsit. Manet certe propositum redeundi ad illa studia, quae si aliquando perfecero, faciam te per meas litteras certiore.³⁸

This is the last we hear of Barzizza's commentary until the later edition of the Orthographia, and it hardly sounds as if he went back to work with any enthusiasm. The long struggle to obtain Enrico's seems to have exhausted him. It remains an open question, at least to my mind, whether Barzizza ever did complete it.³⁹

Barzizza's prolusion to his course on De officiis probably occurs about this time, even though Furietti entitles it, "Oratio in instauratione studiorum Mediolani habita" (p. 73). It is unfortunately often difficult to tell where Furietti gets his titles and dates. The title in the manuscripts makes no reference to Milan,⁴⁰ and nothing in the prolusion speaks of either Milan or Padua. The argument against dating it to his Milanese period, which began in the fall of 1421, rests on the close dependence on Plutarch's Cicero: "quae ex Plutarcho homine doctissimo nuper legi" (p. 75). If Barzizza had completed his own life of Cicero at the time of the prolusion, he surely would have delivered it instead of lifting phrases from Plutarch, and he must have finished it before moving to Milan as he makes no reference to the Lodi manuscript. In fact he probably delivered the prolusion before he knew Bruni's Cicero novus, which is much more to Barzizza's declared purpose of praising Cicero than Plutarch. Bruni, after all, claims that Plutarch's narrative is too slanted towards the unfavorable comparison with Demosthenes, and that this is one of his reasons for writing his own work instead of retranslating (p. 255). Barzizza knew Angeli's translation of Plutarch, which dates from 1400, before 1412, whereas Bruni's dedication of the Cicero novus is from August 1415.⁴¹ There is no

doubt that Barzizza is using Angeli's translation. Despite the disclaimer that his audience should expect Plutarch's "sententias" rather than his "verba" he barely modifies the translation of the first sentences:

Narrat ergo Plutarchus Ciceronis matrem nomine Helviam locupletem feminam fuisse et splendidam egisse vitam. De patre certum nihil proditum est. Sunt qui dicant eum in taberna quadam fullonaria genitum et ibidem ad virilem usque aetatem educatum. Alii genus suum referunt ad Tullium Appium clarum Volscorum regem, qui primus gentis huius Cicero dictus est, a quo Cicerones cognominati sunt.⁴²

At Ciceronem matrem fuisse locupletem et splendidam vitam egisse ferunt. De patre nihil certum proditum est. Sunt qui dicant eum in taberna quadam fullonaria genitum et ibidem ad virilem usque aetatem educatum. Alii genus suum usque ad Tullium Appium referunt, clarum Volscorum regem, qui primus gentis huius Cicero dictus est et tanta laudum celebritate polluit ut eius deinde posteros ab eo cognominari Cicerones non puduerit.⁴³

Bruni, whom Barzizza follows in his own biography, omits the unflattering story about Cicero's father and the fuller's shop. Since Barzizza's renewed interest in De officiis in 1411 predates his attempt to obtain support from Niccolò d'Este, the use of Plutarch makes it even more likely that the proclusion was written for a course he was planning at about this time, but in any case before the move to Milan.

Returning to Barzizza's biography, one notes that he does not

acknowledge his dependence on Bruni's Cicero novus, but does pay tribute to Bruni when mentioning Cicero's translations of Demosthenes' and Aeschines' speeches (56.2-4). A glance at the two biographies shows how great Barzizza's debt is. Nevertheless his additions, omissions, and modifications give the work a character of its own.

For Barzizza Cicero is first and foremost an author. Bruni lists Cicero's writings in the last third of the Cicero novus. Barzizza places them at the beginning in almost exactly Bruni's order, but includes a bit of praise for four of the works, De oratore and Orator, Topica, and De officiis (55.2ff), and adds a note on the unfinished condition of De inventione and on its temporal relationship with the Ad Herennium (54.15-24). Bruni and Plutarch give pride of place to Cicero's consulship and suppression of Catiline; Barzizza passes those events over as too well-known to need recounting (60.21-61.2). In fact all of Cicero's "magistratus" before the proconsulship in Cilicia receive only a passing glance (60.17-20). Cicero's studies, however, receive more attention. Three of Barzizza's additions to Bruni concern them: 1) Cicero's legal education under Q. Mucius Scaevola (50.21-51.2, citing De amicitia 1; cf. Plutarch, Cicero 3), 2) his study of Greek and Roman oratory after the Marsic war (51.9-11), and 3) and his lifelong practice of declamation (51.11-14). Barzizza also amplifies Cicero's studies in the east by presenting his hero as carefully calculating how to profit from his teachers and insisting on his proficiency in Greek (59.8-12, 18-9).

Barzizza is far from lamenting Cicero's involvement in politics as does Petrarch, but neither does he defend the struggle

with Antony as ardently as Zabarella or Vergerio nor does he present as balanced a view of the writer and statesman as does Bruni.⁴⁴ When discussing Cicero's "natura" in one of the longest additions to Bruni, Barzizza does allow that Cicero was suited for politics (57.6-8). Nevertheless he tends to reduce the political career to a by-product of the eloquence because his faith in the power of oratory is so strong: "Sed cum in omni libera civitate, tum Romae inprimis dominari eloquentiam expertus esset..." (59.8-9).

The easiest way to see Barzizza's emphasis on the author is to set his praise of the writings next to Bruni's praise of the man:

Itaque non magis patrem patriae appellare ipsum convenit, quam parentem eloquii et litterarum nostrarum, cuius libros monumentaque si evolvas, nunquam ocium illi fuisse credas ad negocia obeunda. Rursus autem si res gestas eius, si contentiones, si occupationes, si certamina in re publica et privata consideres, nullum tempus illi reliquum fuisse existimes ad legendum vel scribendum. Ita solus, ut credo, hominum duo maxima munera et difficillima adimplevit, ut et in re publica orbis terrarum moderatrice occupatissimus plura scriberet quam philosophi in ocio studioque viventes; et rursus studiis librisque maxime occupatus, plura negocia obierit, quam ii qui vacui sunt ab omni cura litterarum. (p. 285)

Quae omnia tanta facilitate scribendi, cura, studio, elegantia, subtilitate, partim inter summas occupationes, partim inter illas vehementes molestias et acerbissimas perturbationes edita ab eo

sunt, ut non hominis certe mortalis sed quasi dei alicuius opera esse videantur. (56.5-8)

What amazes Bruni is Cicero's dual allegiance to the active and contemplative lives; he is not only "pater patriae" but also "parens eloquii," as in Pliny's formulation (NH 7.117). Barzizza rarely misses a chance to praise Cicero, so it is significant that he omits what Bruni considers Cicero's greatest distinction. In his own exuberance over the writings the highest occupations hardly differ from the powerful annoyances.

Praise of Cicero, in fact, is the dominant tone of Barzizza's work. Several of his additions to Bruni's narrative are nothing more than that: 1) Cicero's reputation for eloquence among the Greeks (59.15-16), 2) his "sapientia" telling him it is better to deserve glory than to receive a triumph (61.24-62.1), 3) the wonderful power of "ratio" in Cicero (70.7-8), 4) Octavian's praise of Cicero, which is transformed from a remark made to a grandchild caught reading a volume of Cicero (Plutarch 49) into something frequently on the lips of the "princeps" (73.12). Everything is presented ad maiorem gloriam Ciceronis. For example, Barzizza magnifies the importance of Cicero's political advice to Caesar at their meeting at Brundisium (63.1-7), just as he exaggerates Cicero's power in Rome right before the battle of Mutina: "Omnia Ciceronis consilio cum in senatu tum in populo agebatur" (66.19). Bruni is much more sober on both occasions. Barzizza's enthusiasm even leads him into slightly ridiculous excesses, as when he mentions Cicero's overcoming his stomach complaint "non tam consilio medicorum quam singulari quadam

temperantia ac abstinencia" (57.10-11).

Even more striking, however, than the insertions of praise is the omission of anything critical of Cicero's behavior. One would think Cicero a saint, if one could forget he is one of the most criticized figures of antiquity.⁴⁵ Leaving aside the invective against Cicero which goes under the name of Sallust and the bitterly passionate cry of betrayal which Petrarch wrote Cicero after discovering the letters to Atticus, Quintus frater, and Brutus, one finds severe censure of Cicero in Barzizza's most important sources, Bruni's Cicero novus and Plutarch's Cicero.

Cicero's mordant wit is very dear to both Plutarch (25-27) and Bruni (pp. 292-293), but Plutarch states that Cicero made enemies because of his penchant to ridicule, and Bruni admits that Cicero exercised his wit "paene intemperanter." Barzizza's only reference to Cicero's sense of humor is the mildly self-deprecating joke about his appetite at Ad familiares 9.20 (57.12-14). A frequent criticism of Cicero was that he did not bear up well under misfortune. Livy (Seneca, Suasoria 6.22) says, "omnium adversorum nihil ut viro dignum erat tulit praeter mortem," which he probably bore well because he suffered nothing which he would not have inflicted had he had the upper hand. Seneca, De brevitae vitae 5.1, is indignant at Cicero's lack of fortitude in adversity. Plutarch is very severe on Cicero's behavior during his exile; even though many people visited him and he was honored by the Greek cities,

subtristis tamen et moestus vitam agebat, et veluti qui insano quodam amore torqueretur, persaepe ad Italiam oculos flectens ita

tenuis, ita sua dignitate electus videbatur ut existimaret nemo virum inprimis eruditum ac tot in studiis litterarum observatum eum extitisse. (sig. X iii; ch. 32)

Bruni echoes this judgment:

Tulit autem hoc exilium non forti animo, nec ut homini philosopho convenire videbatur, saepe damnans se ipsum quod ferro non dimicasset, damnans consilia amicorum et perfidiam culpans, semper ad Italiam conversus, semper dolore et moerore anxius. (pp. 275-276)

A glance at Cicero's letters to Atticus from exile (3.8-21) shows that Plutarch and Bruni do not exaggerate. Barzizza, however, only remarks that he passes over Cicero's consulship, the enmity he aroused, and "quod factione inimicorum in exilium compulsus sit" (60.23-61.1).

On Cicero's most notorious characteristic, conceit, which scholars still argue about today,⁴⁶ Barzizza is silent. In fact he even praises Cicero's "modestia in rebus secundis" (57.23; cf. 57.1) and claims:

Nemo de studiis suis sensit humilior, et cum tanta de illo apud omnes opinio eloquentiae esset ut vel Demostheni anteponeretur, nihil tamen de se arroganter, nihil superbe aut scripsit unquam aut elocutus est. (58.11-14)

Plutarch says that Cicero was so hungry for praise that some doubted his sanity (6) and mentions his self-glorification, which he does not fault even though it made Cicero enemies (24). Seneca expresses his irritation at "illum ipsum consulatum suum non sine causa sed sine fine laudatum" (De brevitate vitae 5.1). Bruni vehemently defends

Cicero for speaking so much about himself and his consulate (p. 291); the eloquence of his defense testifies to the extent he is arguing against contemporary opinion. The significant aspect of Barzizza's presentation is that he never even admits that Cicero did anything that requires a defense.⁴⁷

As part of his campaign to present Cicero in the best possible light Barzizza never misses an opportunity to heighten the pathos of Cicero's death. Bruni, for example, simply states: "*multa etiam, cum mors indigna illum eripuit, scribere instituerat*" (p. 286). Barzizza turns this into the grievous deprivation that posterity has suffered, since Cicero not only would have written more, but would have written even better works (69.4-9), and returns to posterity's loss in his closing sentences.

Bruni's presentation of the death scene is restrained. He tones down the details he takes from Plutarch and allows himself only one reflection on the enormity of the triumvirs' proscription of Cicero (p. 300). The parting between Cicero and his brother provides a concise example of the difference between Bruni's moderate reporting and Barzizza's passionate amplification. Bruni says: "*Lacrimis igitur et complexu mutuo a fratre divisus in Urbem rediit [Quintus]*" (p. 330). Barzizza looses the tearducts: "*a complexu Ciceronis crebro singultu, multo gemitu, infinitis lacrimis divulsus...*" (69.20-21). The scene has become operatic.

Barzizza reinserts some of the more sensational bits from Plutarch, for example, the raven's plucking the cloth off the face of the tired Cicero (70.14-15; Cicero 47). Plutarch proves to be not

sensational enough, and Barzizza resorts to the declamatory tradition preserved by the elder Seneca for details about the punishment of parricides (71.21-23; Controversiae 7.2.3). Barzizza also includes the gruesome story that Antony had Popilius cut off Cicero's head and right hand (71.17-19).⁴⁸

Aside from adding incidents to fill the audience with horror and compassion, Barzizza resorts to all of his rhetorical skills. He presents a trusting Cicero incapable of believing Octavian would betray him (70.4-5). He exclaims aloud against the wickedness of the triumvirs, their cruelty, and inhumanity (68.22-24) and the inevitability of fate (70.18-19). He makes Popilius request the job of murdering Cicero to curry favor with Antony--an embellishment which he borrows from Valerius Maximus 5.3.4--in order to condemn a task deserving the cruellest punishment even in the midst of barbarity (70.23-71.3). He gives Cicero, perhaps taking a hint from Livy (Seneca, Suasoria 7.17), stirring patriotic last words (71.11-13). He paints the grief and indignation of all of Rome (71.24-72.13), almost of the entire world (73.18-21). He brings his "deploratio," as he calls it (74.3), down to the present day to include his own audience: everyone should be in tears.

Although Barzizza focuses so much of his energy on the death scene, a technique reminiscent of hagiography, and in fact presents a perfect, saint-like Cicero, he does not Christianize his hero. This is somewhat surprising, since Barzizza does all in his power to argue for Seneca's conversion.⁴⁹ He does not even mention the consonance of much of Cicero's philosophy with Christianity. Petrarch, for example,

argues for such a consonance and does not hesitate to say, "Neque enim vereor ne parum cristianus sim, si ciceronianus fuero; nichil enim contra Cristum Cicero loquitur, quod certe meminerim."⁵⁰ Not many years after Barzizza wrote his biography Polenton continues Petrarch's line of reasoning and claims that Cicero "locutus est ut illos videatur sequi qui deum esse unum, aeternum, praepotentem, regentem omnia confitentur."⁵¹ Erasmus, in his 1523 preface to his edition of Tusculanae disputationes, leaves open the possibility that Cicero may be in heaven and offers several reasons to support his view.⁵² Barzizza's martyr receives his only reward in the perpetual lamentation of his death and the punishment of those responsible for his murder.

Notes

1. Epistolario di Guarino Veronese, ed. Remigio Sabbadini (1915-19; rpt. Torino, 1959), I 345-346. Guarino is under the mistaken impression that Barzizza found the manuscript himself. Similar praise of Barzizza's character is contained in a letter Guarino wrote six months earlier to an unidentifiable M. B. (I 333). The story of the discovery of the manuscript containing the Ad Herennium, Cicero's De inventione, and more importantly a complete De oratore and Orator and the hitherto unknown Brutus in the cathedral at Lodi by the bishop Gerardo Landriani in 1421 and the transmission of the codex to Barzizza at Milan is too well-known to recount. For the details see Sabbadini, Storia e critica di testi latini, 2nd ed. (Padua, 1971), pp. 77-108.
2. Karl Muellner, Reden und Briefe italienischer Humanisten (1899; rpt. Munich, 1970), p. 166. For more extravagant praise of Barzizza see the letter by Giuseppe Brivio quoted by Agostino Sottili, "Zur Biographie Giuseppe Brivios und Maffeo Vegios," Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch 4 (1967) 222.
3. See the testimonia in Gasparini Barzizii bergomatis et Guinforti filii opera, ed. J. A. Furiettus, I xxxix-xli. Sabellico also makes the mistake of attributing the discovery to Barzizza instead of Landriani.
4. Remigio Sabbadini, Storia del ciceronianismo e di altre questioni letterarie nell'età della Rinascenza (Torino, 1885), pp. 12-17. For examples of how thoroughly Barzizza has been linked to Ciceronianism see Rudolf Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship From 1300 to

1850 (Oxford, 1976), p. 43, and C. Joachim Classen, "Cicerostudien in der Romania im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert," in Cicero ein Mensch seiner Zeit, ed. Gerhard Radke (Berlin, 1968), pp. 207-208. Thaddaeus Zielinski, Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte, 5th ed. (Darmstadt, 1967), pp. 181-182, calls Barzizza the father of Ciceronianism and paraphrases Sabbadini. Since this book is still cited as authoritative (the fourth edition, the last one Zielinski had a hand in, appeared in 1929), one must note how sadly inadequate it is. It is hampered by a narrow devotion to a Burckhardtian conception of Renaissance individualism. Almost all of the material on the Renaissance is taken from Sabbadini or Attilio Hortis, "M. T. Cicerone nelle opere del Petrarca e del Boccaccio," Archeografo Triestino n.s. 6 (1878) 61-158. Zielinski's own contributions are usually inaccurate. For example, he misinterprets a letter by Bruni to mean that he wrote a response to Petrarch's letter to Cicero and claims that the letter is lost. Actually Vergerio wrote the letter, which is extant; see Epistolario di Pier Paolo Vergerio, ed. Leonardo Smith (Rome, 1934), pp. 436-445. Or he claims that Bruni's Cicero novus had only been published in Italian translation, whereas Angelo Mai had edited it in full in 1817, Hans Baron had republished it in part the year before Zielinski's fourth edition, and it had appeared in numerous Renaissance editions of Cicero and Plutarch (see Ludwig Bertalot, "Zur Bibliographie des Leonardus Brunus Aretinus" (1937-38), Studien zum italienischen und deutschen Humanismus, ed. Paul Oskar Kristeller [Rome, 1975] II 288-293).

5. I have edited Barzizza's treatise on imitation and submitted it for

publication; once it has been accepted I will give a fuller reference.

6. Opera, I 182. Here and elsewhere I have modified Furietti's spelling and punctuation. Furietti addresses the letter to Enrico Veronese, the possessor of the commentary on De officiis which Barzizza tried to obtain for so long, but most of the manuscripts have no recipient, and one of them, Arundel 70, addresses the letter to Francesco Barbaro. See Bertalot, "Die aelteste Briefsammlung des Gasparino Barzizza" (1929), Studien II 46.
7. In addition to the pages in Sabbadini's Storia e critica cited in note 1 see Th. Stangl, "Eine uebersehene Handschrift zu Cicero de oratore und zum Orator," Wochenschrift fuer klassische Philologie 30 (1913) 138-142, 160-167, for a description and discussion of Barzizza's copy of these works and his annotations. For Barzizza's work with Cicero's letters to Atticus and Quintus frater, an edition of which he oversaw, see Sabbadini, Storia e critica, pp. 63-65.
8. The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza With Special Reference to his Place in Paduan Humanism (London, 1979), pp. 80-82.
9. Cf. Paul Oskar Kristeller, Iter Italicum, (Leiden and London, 1963-67), I 413: "Anon., comm. on Cicero's de amicitia (inc. Circa hunc auctorem VII sunt consideranda intentio auctoris) and on his de senectute (same Incipit), attributed in the old table of contents to Gasparinus Barzizza."
10. This is one of the manuscripts Giano Parrasio acquired in Vincenza, as one can tell from his ownership note on the verso of the title page. The explicit (f. 14r) to the Synonima Ciceronis is dated, August 1450.
11. Opera, p. 150; no variants in Oxford, Balliol 132, f. 90r, or Milan,

- Ambros. H 49 inf., f. 28v. Mercer, pp. 108-109, misinterprets the sentences which follow to be Barzizza's advice for his son's leisure reading while attending grammar classes in Ferrara between 1410 and 1412. Actually Barzizza is advising Niccolò not to take on too much lecturing at Bologna in 1412. See Remigio Sabbadini, "Dalle nuove lettere di Gasparino Barzizza," Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere 62 (1929) 884-885.
12. "Briciole umanistiche," Giornale storico della letteratura italiana 46 (1905) 74-75; cf. Mercer, p. 99.
 13. "Gasparino Barzizza a Padova. Nuovi ragguagli da lettere inedite," Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova 2 (1969) 4-7.
 14. Dorothy M. Schullian, "A Preliminary List of Manuscripts of Valerius Maximus," Classical Medieval and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman, ed. Charles Henderson, Jr. (Rome, 1964), 84-95, uncovers no trace of a commentary by Barzizza.
 15. See note 38 for the dating.
 16. Letizia A. Panizza, "Gasparino Barzizza's Commentaries on Seneca's Letters," Traditio 33 (1977) 297-358.
 17. Mercer, pp. 91-92; Mazzuconi, "Per una sistemazione dell'epistolario di Gasparino Barzizza," Italia medioevale e umanistica 20 (1977) 184. For a fine survey of commentaries on the Ad Herennium see John O. Ward, "From Antiquity to the Renaissance: Glosses and Commentaries on Cicero's Rhetorica," in Medieval Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric, ed. James J. Murrphy (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1978), pp. 25-67. It will be much easier to assess the position of Barzizza's work once Ward's article on the Ad

Herennium appears in the Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum.

18. For example, consider the statement from De compositione: "Caput autem omnium quae ad elocutionis praecepta attinent illud visum est, ut omnia, sicut dixi, ad rerum de quibus loquimur dignitatem, temporum, locorum, personarum, accommodata sint" (Opera, p. 6; Robert Paul Sonkowsky, "An Edition of Gasparino Barzizza's De compositione," Diss. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1958, p. 12).

Another remark about the importance of decorum appears in De imitatione:

Item quando imitatur, debemus respicere si illa verba et illae sententiae quas inveniremus in libris auctorum decerent illos ad quos scriberemus, quia sicut eadem vestis non decet omnes, ita nec eadem oratio, nam nec unum rusticum nec unum carpentarium deceret habere vestem more iudicis, ita nec eadem oratio quae scriberetur ad iudicem deceret scribi ad carpentarium.

19. Barzizza does refer to Geoffroi de Vinsauf, Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi, in Edmond Faral, Les arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle (1924; rpt. Paris, 1971), pp. 266-267, in connection with "sententia":

Circa partes epistolae certe [a add. BM] nonnullis videtur [videbitur O] haec exornatio maxime [om. B] convenire exordio, quod etiam Gualfredus, natione anglicus, vir eruditissimus, testari videtur [videbitur O] cum poetas instruens tractat de ordine artificiali, quem cum in octo species diviserit, tres ex illis attribuit proverbio cum aliquam [a add. O] nobis assumpsimus aut [om. O] fabulam aut [vel O] historiam

describendam vel initium sumendo a principio rei vel a medio vel a fine per proverbium. (B, ff. 66v-67r; M, f. 85r; O, f. 110r)

When more than one manuscript of a work exists, I follow--after much hesitation--the conventions of classical orthography and record no orthographical variants.

20. For the parts of a letter and dictaminal theory in general see James J. Murphy, Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1974), pp. 194-268.
21. See the note of ownership from Rome, Biblioteca Angelica 2137, published by Sabbadini, Epistolario di Guarino, III 126-127. Mercer, pp. 83 and 93, mentions the lectures.
22. Iter Italicum, I 413, lists the contents of of the manuscript. At the top of f. 109r one reads, "Argumenta in 15 orationes marci .T."; the rest of f. 109rv is blank. Bonsi is a familiar figure in Barzizza's correspondence, a student and friend from 1407. He was a Venetian and on good terms with Andrea Giuliano and Daniele Vettori, two of Barzizza's closest friends. One gathers that Bonsi was particularly interested in the study of Cicero, for in one of his letters to Bonsi, dated by Bertalot to 1418, Barzizza replies to his request "si quod ad effingendum Ciceronem auxilium satis ex promptu haberem" (Studien, II 98). Barzizza promises to send him a corrected copy of Tusculanae disputationes divided into chapters with brief summaries prefixed, just the type of work he did with De oratore (Sabbadini, Storia e critica, pp. 78-84). See Mazzuconi's index, p. 239, for Barzizza's other letters to Bonsi.

23. Barzizza mentions owning Loschi's Inquisitio in a letter to Vettori, Opera, p. 206; the letter must be before 1410 because it is contained in Vatican City, lat. 5223, which was written in Ferrara about that time for Donato Albanzani (Bertalot, Studien, II 34; Mazzuconi, p. 235). It is likely that Barzizza knew the work much earlier because it dates from the period when both he and Loschi were at Pavia (Sabbadini, Storia e critica, pp. 19-21). Among other cases Barzizza is referring to Loschi when he mentions the following opinion on De lege manilia:

Secundum quosdam post divisionem huius orationis, que incipit ibi, "Primum mihi videtur etc." (6), fit confirmatio et incipit ibi, "Genus est enim" (6), ubi dicunt quod etiam propositio argumentacionis et ratio ipsius propositionis incipit ibi, "Tarditate agitur salus" (6: tradita est, agitur, as in Loschi), confirmatio vero ipsius rationis ibi, "Et quoniam semper appententes" (7). (f. 110r)

(The parentheses add references to Cicero's speech and, where it differs from Barzizza's lemma, Cicero's text itself from A. C. Clark's edition, M. Tulli Ciceronis orationes, vol. 1 [Oxford, 1905].) For the passage in Loschi see the editio princeps of Asconius (Venice, 1477; Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke n. 2739), sig. a 7^v (the signatures are renumbered at the beginning of Loschi). Barzizza follows this with the opinion of "others" whom I am unable to identify. Often Barzizza just adopts Loschi's views, for example, the triple "captatio benevolentiae" in the exordium of this speech, the beginning of the "narratio" and "divisio," and the choice and

identification of the first few figures.

24. Sig. a 5. Cf. Sabbadini, La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Veronese (1896; rpt. Torino, 1964), pp. 59-60.
25. For the numbers in parenthesis see note 23; the brackets indicate the reading of the Naples manuscript in an obviously corrupt passage.
26. Bertalot, II 288-289, mentions the two manuscripts which contain the biography, as does Kristeller, Iter Italicum, I 349, II 315. Mercer, p. 82, refers to it in passing.
27. "Hortamur autem et provocamus omnes qui ingenue eruditi elegantius et probabilius de iisdem rebus scribere poterunt, ut parenti et principi litterarum nostrarum suum quisque scribendi studium certatim exhibeat. Nam neque ulli magis litterae nostrae debentur, quam illi qui eas nobis tradit: et mihi tanti est Ciceronis honor ut vehementer exoptem a multis de hoc ipso scribentibus superari," M. Tullii Ciceronis sex orationum partes, ed. Angelo Mai (Milan, 1817), p. 256.
28. Ciceronis orationum scholiastae, ed Thomas Stangl (1912; rpt. Hildesheim, 1964), II 37.
29. In any event long before the discovery of Asconius Barzizza knew about Milo's exile. In a letter consoling Zaccaria Trevisan for the failure of his missions to Gregory XII and the antipope in December 1407 and January 1408 Barzizza congratulates him on his speeches and illustrates the proverb that the orator cannot always be persuasive with a reference to Cicero's unsuccessful defense of Milo (J.-B. Mittarelli, Bibliotheca codicum manuscriptorum monasterii S. Michaelis Venetiarum (Venice, 1779), pp. 437-438. See Sabbadini, "Lettere e orazioni inedite di Gasparino Barzizza," Archivio storico lombardo s.

- 2, 13 (1886) 370-371, and Storia e critica, p. 64. For Barzizza's use of Asconius in the Orthographia see Sabbadini, "Spogli Ambrosiani latini," Studi italiani di filologia classica 11 (1903) 369-370.
30. Sabbadini, Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV (Florence, 1905), pp. 77-79. A. C. Clark, Q. Asconii Pediani orationum Ciceronis quinque enarratio, (Oxford, 1907), p. xiv, gives the date as 20 July 1417. The director of the Laurenziana, Dr. Antonietta Morandini, kindly informs me that Sabbadini gives the correct transcription. A more accessible edition of Cencio's important letter is Bertalot, "Cincius Romanus und seine Briefe" (1929-30), Studien II 144-147. Clark, p. xv, adds an interesting bit of evidence for Barzizza's familiarity with Asconius: "Scholion Pisonianae in codd. non nullis praefixum 'hic deesse aliquid ex Asconio patet' Gasparini esse dicitur in cod. Venet. (Bessar.) ccccxvii."
31. Colombo, pp. 26-27, publishes a letter Barzizza wrote in Constance, 28 July 1416, and shows, pp. 8-10, that the date is correct. For Poggio's letter, which Sabbadini, Epistolario di Guarino Veronese III 74-75, proves can be no later than December 1417, see A. C. Clark, "The Literary Discoveries of Poggio," Classical Review 13 (1899) 124-125.
32. Sabbadini, Storia e critica, pp. 288-291, reconstructs this date from a letter he shows Barzizza wrote the cardinal Branda Castiglioni. Cf. Tino Foffano, "Tra Padova, Parma e Pavia: Appunti su tre allievi di Gasparino Barzizza," Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova 2 (1969) 30.

33. Sabbadini, Storia e critica, p. 92. One might hesitate about dating the biography before the discovery of the Lodi manuscript because Barzizza separates the Orator from the De oratore, and we know that Barzizza, in his copy of these works now in Naples thought the Orator the fourth book of De oratore (Sabbadini, p. 80, and Stangl, "Handschrift," pp. 139-140). In the biography, however, Barzizza is merely following Bruni's division (p. 287). One also imagines that Barzizza would have made use of the autobiographical passage at the end of Brutus, as did Sicco Polenton in his life of Cicero, Sicconis Polentoni scriptorum illustrium latinae linguae libri XVIII, ed. B. L. Ullman (Rome, 1928), pp. 277-279, etc.
34. Milan, Ambros. R 67 sup., s. v. hemiciclus, as quoted by Sabbadini, "Spogli," 363.
35. Oxford, Balliol College 132, f. 178r. For evidence that there were more than the two editions of the Orthographia see Mazzuconi, pp. 195-197, and Mercer, pp. 48-59. The Balliol manuscript contains only the first two books and differs from what Sabbadini, on the basis of Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashb. 881, calls the first edition. For example, it does not contain the references to Victorinus and Asconius (Sabbadini, p. 369) and gives the passage quoted, pp. 368-369, in a substantially different version:
- quorum michi princeps omnium visus est priscianus cesariensis,
nec dubito que ab aulo gelio, que a quintiliano, a Servio queque
locis quibusdam a Varrone de orthographia scripta comperiuntur
magnam habere auctoritatem et esse doctorum hominum usu probata,
sed pauca admodum ac sparsa in eorum libris leguntur, ab hoc vero

et plurima et uno in loco et acuratissime de ratione scribendi
precepta referuntur. Placet itaque.... (f. 143v)

36. Opera, p. 134. For the date see Sabbadini, "Lettere," p. 376.
Sabbadini's correction of Furietti's "Martinus Garanelo" is confirmed by Balliol 132, f. 105r, and Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, CCCIII (303), f. 51r, both of which read "Marinus Garavello."
37. The Verona manuscript dates the letter "VII idus septembris" instead of "decembris" (Mazzuconi, p. 210); Bertalot, II 43, says merely, "Mehrfach datiert."
38. Bertalot, II 93. The dating of the final letters is uncertain.
Sabbadini, "Lettere," p. 567, placed the April letter in 1411. If one assumes that the manuscripts' dates are correct--and one does not have to rely on Furietti because all of the dates concerned have unambiguous manuscript support, except the one mentioned in the last note, as one can see by consulting numbers 6, 49, 50, 57, and 112 of Bertalot's inventory of Balliol 132 (II 42-54)--it is highly improbable that this April letter is from 1411. That assumption would have Barzizza write Fantascello a letter full of thanks, 23 March, threaten to end the friendship about two weeks later, 8 April, probably have written the other warning letter in the meantime, as it is hard to imagine it after the April ultimatum, and then resume negotiations the following 18 June. The final letter in the series bears no date, but must be towards the end of September because Barzizza offers his correspondent part of his commentary on Seneca if a messenger arrives before 1 October. The main reason to assume that the letter is from 1412 is that Barzizza, given his irritation with

Fantascello, probably would not have allowed the affair to drag on much longer, for even on this assumption it takes about 18 months to obtain Enrico's commentary.

39. A study of Barzizza's manuscript of De officiis (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale IV G 7) should reveal more about his involvement with that work, if not about the commentary itself. It is unfortunately difficult to identify the handwriting. The annotations are extensive, so much so that a few pages have more annotation than text. The hand which signs itself "Gasp." in Barzizza's manuscript of De oratore (see Stangl, "Handscript," p. 139) is present, but the small, precise hand which Sabbadini identifies as Barzizza's in a manuscript of Claudian (Milan, Ambros. M 5 sup., see "Spogli," pp. 359-361) seems also to be present. The two hands bear little resemblance. The hand signing itself "Guin." in the De oratore is also present and perhaps another. I leave the problem to someone with a better knowledge of Barzizza's handwriting, and will only comment that contrary to an assertion by Ugo Lepore, "Postille Petrarquesche o note del Barzizza? (Cod. Napol. IV C 32 delle 'Periochae' liviane)," Giornale italiano di filologia 3 (1950) 348, and Mercer, p. 154, this manuscript does not contain De amicitia and De senectute, although these two works are listed in a table of contents at the beginning of the manuscript. In addition to De officiis (ff. 1r-53r) and Paradox Stoicorum (ff. 54v-71v) the manuscript has an excerpt from Lactantius, Divinae institutiones, the beginning of book 6 under the heading De sacro cultu 6 (ff. 74r-75r) and Seneca, the excerpts from Epistolae morales under the heading De paupertate et divitiis (ff. 75v-76v; the last excerpt is missing, see

L. Annaei Senecae Opera, ed. Fridericus Haase [Leipzig, 1853], III 458-461). On f. 76v appears the note, "Antonij Seripandi ex Iani Parrhasij testamento." At the end of the manuscript (f. 77r) one reads, "Iste liber est meus baptiste bergomensis de suardis," and on the verso of the flyleaf, "Iani parrhasij et Amicorum duobus aureis emptus mediolani de hered. Gasparini bergomatis."

40. "Gasparini Pergamensis Oratio in laudem .M. T. Ciceronis qui de offitiis inscribitur quam catedrans habuit ad eius discipulos pro principio ipsius libri," Parma, Biblioteca Palatina 262, f. 6r, as given by Bertalot, "Uno zibaldone umanistico latino del Quattrocento a Parma" (1936-37), Studien II 244. "In principio alicuius librorum Ciceronis," Rome, Biblioteca Angelica 1139, ff. 112v; see Catalogus codicum manoscriptorum praeter Graecos et orientales in Biblioteca Angelica, ed. Henricus Narducci (Rome, 1893), I 479.
41. In a letter dated 3 March 1412 Barzizza asks Francesco Barbaro to send him Loschi's Inquisitio and his own or Barbaro's Plutarch for his lectures (Opera, p. 146). The request of Loschi points to a course on Cicero's speeches, so it is fair to guess that the Plutarch contained Cicero. The tone of the letter implies that Barzizza had not recently acquired Plutarch. For information on Angeli's translation see Vito R. Giustiniani, "Sulle traduzioni latine delle 'Vite' di Plutarco nel Quattrocento," Rinascimento s. 2, 1 (1961) 3-62, Roberto Weiss, "Lo studio di Plutarco nel Trecento" (1953) and "Iacopo Angeli da Scarperi (c.1360-1410-11)" (1955), now in his Medieval and Humanist Greek: Collected Essays (Padua, 1977), pp. 204-226, 255-277. See Bertalot, II 291-293, for printed editions of Angeli's translation, none of

which went under his name. Domenico di Bandino da Arezzo made use of Angeli's translation soon after its completion for his De viris claris; see A. Teresa Hankey, "The Library of Domenico di Bandino," Rinascimento s. 2, 8 (1957) 190.

42. Opera, p. 75. Besides my normal modification of Furietti's spelling and punctuation, I have corrected the obvious misprint "Aliis" and changed the name of Cicero's mother from "Elinam," which is probably a misreading of "Elviam" due to the resemblance of "ui" and "in." The edition of Angeli's translation which I use omits the mother's name, but one sees from Plutarch himself that the name must have been "Helvia."
43. I cite Angeli's translation, with modified spelling and punctuation, from the first printed edition, Achillis Bononiensis Apologia in Plautum, Vita Ciceronis auctore Plutarcho nuper inventa ac diu desiderata (Bologna, 1508), sig. S iii. Barzizza follows Angeli's mistranslation: "qui primus..." should not be a relative clause referring to Tullius Appius, but the beginning of a new sentence and the first mention of another descendent. This is an example of one of the errors in translation which made Bruni decide to replace Angeli; Bruni's own version, p. 257, shows that he understands the Greek.
44. See Hans Baron's classic paper, "Cicero and the Roman Civic Spirit in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 22 (1938) 72-97, and Agostino Sottili, "La questione ciceroniana in una lettera di Francesco Zaberella a Francesco Petrarca," Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova 6 (1974) 25-57.

45. Helene Homeyer, Die antiken Berichte ueber den Tod Ciceros und ihre Quellen (Baden-Baden, 1964) provides convenient lists of passages criticizing Cicero in the ancient biographical tradition.
46. A. E. Douglas, Cicero (Oxford, 1968), pp. 24-26.
47. Even Polenton, who exalts Cicero as much as Barzizza, feels the necessity of justifying his hero's behavior. For example, Polenton (p. 420) tacitly enters the argument produced by Petrarch's attack (Familiari 24.3.5) on Cicero's struggle with Antony by approving the very reason Petrarch threw in Cicero's face: the passage from Brutus' letter to Cicero, Ad Brutum 1.16.7, accusing him of seeking a friendlier master. In one passage Polenton does criticize Cicero's betrayal of former friends: "Civis nanque splendidus ac vir consularis M. Bibulus, quem suis in calamitatibus amicissimum habuisset, ignominose ab eo reprehensus ac turpiter criminatus est" (p. 368). Polenton is also conscious of ancient carping at Cicero, although he thinks it mostly due to envy (p. 74). Another example of an admirer of Cicero forced onto the defensive is Quintilian 12.1.14-18.
48. It is difficult to state just where Barzizza took some of the details for his narrative of Cicero's death because he was very familiar with the elder Seneca, Valerius Maximus, Florus, and the Periochae Livianae, all of whom have a death scene. He does not follow Plutarch for the detail of the hand affixed to the rostra because Plutarch mentions both hands (cf. Homeyer, p. 14). For Barzizza's Seneca see Remigio Sabbadini, "Spigolature latine," Studi italiani di filologia classica 5 (1897) 391, for Valerius Maximus, Colombo, p. 5, and

Alfredo Azzoni, "Ricerche Barzizziane," Bergomum 54 (1960) 20, and for Florus and the Periochae, Sabbadini, "Le 'Periochae Livianae' del Petrarca possedute dai Barzizza," in A. Annoni, H. Cochin et al. F. Petrarca e la Lombardia (Milan, 1904), pp. 195-201, and Lepore, pp. 347-351.

9. Panizza, pp. 319-325.

0. Le Familiari, ed. Vittorio Rossi and Umberto Bosco (Florence, 1933-42) 21.10.8.

1. Scriptorum, p. 461. On Polenton's humanist hagiography see Giuseppe Toffanin, Storia dell'Umanesimo, 2nd ed. (Bologna, 1964), II 111-116. Toffanin is wrong, however, to take Bruni's Cicero novus as an example of hagiography.

2. Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami, ed. P. S. Allen, H. M. Allen, H. W. Garrod (Oxford, 1906-58), V 339.

Appendix I

Exornationes colorum et sententiarum Gasparini Pergamensis rethorici eximii

B: Oxford, Balliol College 132, f. 60v.
 M: Venice, Marc. lat. XIV 68 (4735), f. 77r.
 O: Vatican City, Ott. lat. 1438, f. 108r.

Cum exornationes verborum atque sententiarum non semper omnibus
 convenient partibus orationis, aut aequè principaliter, sic etiam magis
 plerumque uni causarum generi competant quam alteri, similiter uni figurae
 orationis quam alteri et ceteris partibus eloquentiae de quibus ars
 5 praescribit, operae pretium est hanc de elocutione praeceptionem paulo
 altius repetere ut primum inquiratur quae figura unicuique respondeat
 colori quotiens in graeco conveniret aliquem ornatum similem invenire.
 Secundo cui generi causarum principalius unaquaeque exornationis species
 congruat. Tertio cui parti orationis aptius conveniat. Quarto quantum ad
 10 exordium cui generi accidentali melius serviat. Quinto in qua
 constitutione frequentius locum habeat. Sexto in qua parte
 argumentationis. Septimo in qua figura. Octavo quaeri posset qua ratione
 unaquaeque species exornationis pronuntiari debeat. Nono et ultimo quoniam
 15 sicut imperfectum instrumentum ab instrumento perfecto vel tamquam remissum
 ab intenso, non est alienum praescribere cui parti epistolae unusquisque
 ornatus dignius venustiusque respondeat. Ordo itaque deinceps erit

1 post cum add. semper O non semper om. O partibus convenient
 omnibus B 2 magis om. B 4 magis om. B alterius O et ceteris
om. O 7 conveniet B convenit M 15 instrumentum perfectum ab
 instrumento imperfecto O

secundum praescriptum modum discutere totum artis opus in ordine ad
 unumquemque colorem sive is color sit verborum priorum sive
 transumptivorum sive sententiarum. Et quoniam primum locum repetitio
 possidet tum auctoritate Ciceronis, tum quadam dignitate et splendore sui,
 5 ab hac ipsa exornatione prius ducetur praeceptio. Si hoc in omni
 praeceptione huius artis prius suppositum fuerit, nullum esse in arte
 dicendi praeceptum quod ex causa, loco, tempore, et dignitate personarum
 non possit variari! Amentis enim est, ut dicitur, contra rationem
 superstitione praeceptorum duci. Satis itaque erit si haec de exornatione
 10 praeceptio, licet non semper, tamen in pluribus locum habeat.

1 discurrere M 4 tamen quadam B et om. O 5 si...habeat om. M0

Appendix II

Vita Marci Tulli Ciceronis

The Manuscripts

T Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Trotti 83, ff. 107r-116r. T is paper, written by several hands, and from the fifteenth century. It now has 141 folia, although at one time it contained more; the final work, Leonardo Giustinian's translation of Plutarch's Lucullus, breaks off in the middle of a sentence and at the end of quire with the catchword "fugatos totiens." T contains another of Giustinian's translations from Plutarch, Cimon, in addition to various works by Bruni, De militia, Oratio in hypocritas, Cicero novus, and translations of Plutarch's Cato, Demosthenes, Sertorius, and Aemilius. The scribe who wrote Barzizza's biography did not write anything else in the manuscript. The life has a quire to itself, ff. 106-117; 106rv and 116v-117v are blank except for a catchword at the bottom of 117v, "Nec hrdem (?) institui," which are not the first words on the next page. It is thus possible that the biography was inserted into the manuscript. T contains a long dittography after "ad" at 6.7 of 6.3 "qui" to "ad."

V Vatican City, Vat. lat. 2944, ff. 26r-35r. V is paper and from the fifteenth century, was written by one hand, and has 50 folia. It contains Bruni's translations of Plutarch's Sertorius and Aemilius and two anonymous works. After the title on f. 26r another hand, perhaps a later one, has written: "in vitis plutarchi est vita translata per L. arretinum."

Except for differences in orthography T and V agree in most of their readings. Neither one, however, is a copy of the other. At 50.18 T has "conventio" and a space for a word, at 58.20 T omits "meruisset" and leaves a space for a word, and at 72.10-11 T omits several words. Thus V is not a copy of T. Nor is T a copy of V. The words omitted at 72.10-11 come at the very top of f. 34v in V, and "in," the first word on the page, is not separated from the second, "lepidum." A scribe copying from V would not have been able to skip the words which T omits.

For the sake of consistency I have always written "Octavianus," although at 66.9, 67.5,10,17,20, 68.11, 70.4, 72.11 V has "Ottavius" (V frequently writes "t" for "c"), and at 68.11 and 70.4 T has "Octavius." I have followed conventions of classical orthography and record no purely orthographical variants, which are numerous, especially with the proper names. I have changed the name of Cicero's mother from the manuscripts' "Orbia" to "Helvia" (50.4) and the name of Philo's teacher to "Clitomachi" (50.20; T Clitarechi, V Clitarchi) to accord with modern editions of Plutarch. The punctuation is my own. The few references to ancient authors and their works in the apparatus use the abbreviations of the Oxford Latin Dictionary (Oxford, 1968-).

Ciceronem loco illustri natum constans antiquorum fama et vulgata opinio testis est, quae a Tullio rege Volscorum originem eum duxisse affirmat. Quod certum est, Cicero ex Arpino municipio Volscorum ortus, Tullio patre et matre Helvia genitus est, ac natus tertio nonas ianuarii, 5 Quinto Caepione et Serrano consulibus. Ideo Cicero cognominatus, quod is qui primum ex ea familia Cicero dictus est in extrema nasi parte eminentiam quandam in figuram ciceris habuit, a quo omnes qui descenderent Cicerones sunt cognominati. Fertur autem nutrici eius phantasma quoddam apparuisse ac dixisse magnam rei publicae salutem illam nutrire, quod res ipsa 10 confirmavit. Ex ordine equestri fuit honesto sane et in quo rei publicae robur contineretur.

Qui ut primum per aetatem percipiendis litteris idoneus fuit, ingenio, indole, studio adeo inter equales eminebat, ut etiam a filiis principium civitatis iter simul agendo, ut fit honoris causa, semper in 15 medio haberetur. Primam eius laudem a poesi initiatus est. Puer etiam libellos quosdam metricae composuit. Cum vero aetate paulo maiusculus factus esset, orationi solutae operam dedit, quam et naturae suae aptiorem et rebus agendis multo conventiorem esse intelligebat. Fuerunt haec aetatis primae studia. Sequens aetas philosophiae inhaesit, in qua 20 Philonem academicum Clitomachi discipulum Romae praeceptorem nactus est. Dehinc a patre sumpta virili toga, velut de se ipse in Laelio meminit, ad Scaevolam augurem deductus est ac prudentia eius doctior factus. Quo mortuo, ubi intellexit neque oratorem quenquam sine iuris civilis scientia posse iure dici, neque civem illum appellandum qui iura suae civitatis

ignoraret, erudiendum se atque instruendum Quinto Mucio Scaevolae pontifici maximo viro in iure civili gravissimo tradidit.

Erat autem Romanae iuventutis decus vel praecipuum militia, neque haberi quisquis magnus in civitati poterat qui non rebus pacis et belli
 5 instructus esset, nec turpe ducebatur armis admiscere litteras et rursus arma litteris. Bello itaque Marsico sub Lucio Sulla adulescens militavit, et nisi furor bellorum civilium propositum militandi--quod hoc genus militiae detestandum ei videbatur--interrupisset, perseverare diutius in armis animus erat. Conversis itaque armorum studiis ad eas artes quas a
 10 puero didicerat, maiorem vitae partem in legendis orationibus cum Graecis tum Latinis consumebat. Et quoniam in foro versari et causas agere non prius statuerat quam vires ingenii expertus esset, nonnumquam in scholis rhetorum declamabat. Quae postea in aetate perfectiori ab eo repetita consuetudo et cum summis viris instituta illum iam paene senem delectavit.

15 Et quia studiorum eius ac ingenii locum ingressus sum, de rebus gestis postea, nunc de his quae ab eo sunt divinitus scripta dicendum videtur. Quattuor itaque scriptorum Ciceronis tradunt fuisse genera, quattuor partibus vitae eius attributa, cum enim partim in re familiari, partim in iudiciis, partim in re publica, partim in otio versaretur. Sic
 20 nonnullas epistolas familiares ad amicos scripsit, nonnullas ad statum rei publicae pertinentes. Orationes vero alias forenses, alias publicas, id est, in senatu vel ad populum habitas, elegantissimo genere dicendi scripsit. Libros autem quamplures eo tempore in otio edidit quo armis res publica oppressa opera eius uti non poterat.

Et ut ab epistolis incipiam quarum apud nos extat memoria, sex ac triginta libris volumen earum distinctum esse constat, quorum librorum sedecim ad Atticum, tres ad Quintum fratrem, reliqui ad Marcum Brutum, ad Lentulum, ad Sulpicium, ad Varronem, ad Caelium, et ad alios

5 praestantissimos eius aetatis viros inscripti sunt. Quarum epistolarum aliae in mediocri figura versantur, aliae in gravi, sed plurimae in mediocri. Sunt nonnulli auctores qui tradunt libros praeterea multos epistolarum ad Marcum filium, ad Cornelium Nepotem, ad Gaium Caesarem ad Hirtium, ad Pansam, ad Caesarem Octavianum, quorum nullus hodie reperitur,
10 eum scripisse. Haec de epistolis.

Venio ad orationes quae ad nostras manus aut notitiam pervenerunt. Sed cum genere inter se differant, aliaeque in senatu sive ad populum ut dixi, aliae in foro habitae sint, tum forensium quae duo sunt genera, quarum aliae ad privatas causas, idem ad civiles, aliae ad publicas, quas
15 criminales appellant, locus hic explicandus est. Ad rem publicam pertinentes hae sunt: pro lege manilia apud quirites, quam de imperio magni Pompaei Gellius de noctibus atticis vocat, de consulatu suo, quam kalendis ianuarii antequam consulatum adiret in senatu habuit. Ad populum: de lege agraria, de filiis proscriptorum, pro Othone, pro Rabirio, duae item ad
20 legem agrariam pertinentes, in Catilinam quattuor, in Metellum una, in Sallustium altera, de exilio suo tres, de provinciis consularibus una, de responsis haruspicum una, pro Marco Marcello una, in Marcum Antonium libri orationum tredecim, quas alii Antonianas ut Gellius, alii Philippicas appellant, quae ad imitationem orationum Demosthenis in Philipppum editae

8 ad Hirtium] et Hirtium T 17 Gel. 1.7.16,20 23 Gel. 1.22.17,
6.11.3, etc.

sunt et ita a Cicerone studio atque admiratione ingenii Demosthenis nominatae. Forenses vero omnes paene criminales sunt: pro Publio Quinctio, quam annos duos et viginti natus, si Cornelio Nepoti credimus, in privato iudicio primam omnium habuit, pro Roscio, anno vero qui insecutus est, 5 dehinc variis temporibus, pro Aulo Cluentio, Verrinae septem, oratio in Vatinius testem, pro Publio Sexto, pro Lucio Murena, pro Publio Sulla, pro Gnaeo Plancio, pro Cornelio Balbo, pro Lucio Flacco, pro Marco Caelio, pro Fundanio, pro Vareno, pro Caecina, pro Milone, pro Archia, pro Scauro, pro Oppio, pro Tullio, pro domo sua ad pontifices, pro Quinto Ligario apud 10 Caesarem, qua oratione tantum admirationis consecutus est, ut quantum eloquentia in omnibus causis posset, nunquam alias dinoscere pulcrius fuerit.

Quantum enim illud fuit, cum Gaius Caesar ita se confirmasset ut de Ligario damnando fixum in animo ac constitutum haberet, posteaquam in 15 adversarium iaci illa a Cicerone fulmina sensit cum in ardenti ore diceret, "Quid enim, Tubero, ille tuus districtus in acie Pharsalica gladius agebat? cuius latus petebat? quis erat sensus armorum tuorum? quae tua mens, oculi, manus, ardor animi? quid petebas, quid optabas?" Ita belli civilis refricare animum Caesaris memoria coepit et illam qua in acie Pharsalica 20 adversus hostes usus pugnando erat ferocitatem iracundiamque excitare ut neque corpore neque animo consisteret subindeque vultum crebro coloremque mutaret libellosque in manibus quos forte habebat tanquam attonitus deiceret.

2 post criminales add. omnes V 4 pro Roscio Huc transtuli. post Quinctio TV (vide Gel. 15.28 17 patebat T (cf. Lig. 9, Quint. 8.4.27, etc.)

Habuit item aliam insignem pro rege Deiotaro orationem apud eundem. Innumerabiles paene alias editas a se esse orationes constans opinio est, quarum ne quidem nomina quadam sive fati iniquitate sive negligentia hominum atque inertia ad nos pervenerunt, quibus omnibus illum
 5 semper superiorem discessisse, nec ulla unquam in causa subcubuisse excepta Miloniana, ut Asconius tradit. Item pro Scamandro Fabriciorum liberto, velut ipse in Cluentiana meminit, certi auctores sunt. Quod etiam adversarii saepe ei invidiae contrahendae causa obiecerunt, cum illum in foro atque in causis regnare et in quam partem vellet animos iudicum
 10 impellere eum dicerent.

Verum quoniam quod hae tot et tantae res ex abditis atque reconditis fontibus artis emanarunt, non praetereundi sunt libri quos de ratione dicendi studio attentissimo conscripsit. Non enim artis commemoratio ab orationibus et epistolis, quae ex arte natae sunt, est
 15 seperanda. In quae itaque artis volumina Ciceronem scripisse comperio primo libros quattuor ad Gaium Herennium, secundo libros duos de inventione, quos imperfectos nescio quo impedimento reliquit, cum ad Herennium de quinque partibus oratoris officii, inventionē scilicet, dispositione, elocutione, memoria, pronuntiatione, bene et dilucide
 20 scripsisset. Ita enim quibusdam viris doctissimis placere intelligo ut ars illa de inventione, quam fere omnes rhetoricam veterem appellant, posterius scripta sit et haec, quae nova communiter dicitur, inprimis edita ab eo fuerit. Quam opinionem nulla alia puto ratione ortam esse, nisi quod illa de inventione videtur subtilius accuratiusque conscripta. Scripsit item

tanta diligentia libros de oratore tres ad Quintum fratrem et unum ad Marcum Brutum qui ab eo orator inscribitur ut neque maiori eloquentia neque ampliori praeceptorum copia uti in scribendo potuerit. In quibus libris non solum Isocraticam sed etiam Aristotelicam vim oratoriam complexus est.

- 5 Item de optimo genere dicendi ad Marcum Brutum libellum addidit, et item unum de partitione oratoria ad filium. Quid commentarios graece ad Posidonium philosophum de consulatu suo scriptos, quid libros de suis temporibus numero tres ab eo editos vel laudando commemorare vel commendando laudare oportet? Quid topica illa ad Trebatium scripta dicam,
- 10 in quibus tanta vel ingenii vel memoriae vis est vel ex hoc patet quod in navi ac sine libris illa a se cum breviter tum dilucide scripta extiterint?

- Reliquum ut ad libros in omni paene philosophiae parte mirifice scriptos accedamus. Memorantur libri sex de re publica e quibus praeter exiguum illud sexti libri fragmentum, quod de somno Scipionis dicitur,
- 15 nihil ad nos pervenit. Scripsit de finibus bonorum et malorum libros quinque, in quibus quattuor sectas philosophorum expressit, stoicam, peripateticam, Epicuream, et academicam; libros Tusculanarum quaestionum quinque; de natura deorum tres; de divinatione duos; de legibus tres; in vituperatores philosophiae unum; academicorum libros quattuor; de
- 20 senectute, de amicitia, de consolatione, libros singulos; de gloria libros duos; de fato unum; laudationem Catonis; paradoxa ad Brutum; et hos tres de officiis ad Marcum filium prorsus divinos, in quibus nullam vitae partem, quae non sanctissimis praeceptis instituta sit, desertam destitutamque reliquit. Platonis Timaeum ex graecis litteris in latinas vertit, item

Protagoram Xenofontis librum economicum, librum Arati, Demosthenis et Aeschinis orationes duas pro Ctesiphonte et in Ctesiphontem, quarum copia nulla haberetur nisi beneficio Aretini ambae iterum essent ex Graecia, ut multa alia egregio orationis genere, litteris latinis ad nos traductae.

5 Quae omnia tanta facilitate scribendi, cura, studio, elegantia, subtilitate, partim inter summas occupationes, partim inter illas vehementes molestias et acerbissimas perturbationes edita ab eo sunt, ut non hominis certe mortalis sed quasi dei alicuius opera esse videantur. Haec de ingenio et studiis eius.

10 Superest ut de natura, de moribus, de rebus eius gestis et magistratibus brevissime dicamus. Quae omnia si ordine prosequi vellem et ea copia quam Plutarchus ceterique Plutarchum imitati exequi, tardius quam optatis ad rem ipsam accessus esset. Brevi itaque ut institui haec ipsa quae dixi attingam. Naturam ipsam duplicem in uno quoque philosophi esse
15 tradunt, unam corporis, alteram animi, quas quodam inter se vinculo ac societate devinctas esse affirmant, ita ut neque corpus sine anima, neque rursus animam sine corpore posse vim suam explicare certum sit. Illud autem perspicuum est, corpora quae densa et gravia sunt lumen ingenii obtundere, neque in se magnificum aliquid aut excelsum sine viribus animi
20 corpus habere. Ex quo aiunt corpora illa, quae rarae texturae sunt, moli carne temperata, in quibus sanguinea complexio dominatur, ingeniis humanis favere, et eos in quibus naturam hanc prospicimus ceteris hominibus non modo earum artium studiis quae in cognitione sunt posita sed etiam

1 Protagoram] Bruni (p. 286) Pictagoram TV 2 in om. T 3 haberetur
scripsi habebetur TV 10 rebus om. T 15 inter se] interesse V
18 lumine T ingenii scripsi ingenio TV

prudencia, humanitate, modestia, multisque aliis virtutibus et magnis et egregiis praestare.

Quam vere dignitatem in utranque partem praestitisse in Cicerone res ab eo scriptae indicant. Hanc itaque eius sive naturam sive
 5 complexionem corporis fuisse memorant, ut corpore tanto gracilis esset non tam ad sarcinas et pondera ferenda quam ad labores animi, id est, ad forenses causas, ad rem publicam gubernandam, ad res divinas humanasque penitus prospiciendas et natus et institutus videretur. Quibus in rebus cum omnes suas cogitationes, omne suum studium, vigilias omnes consumerit,
 10 valitudine stomachi laborari coepit. Quem morbum non tam consilio medicorum quam singulari quadam temperantia atque abstinencia leviolem ac sibi minus molestum reddebat. Fuit igitur cibi non solum parci sed adeo tenuis ut integram famem, velut ridens ac iocens ad Lucium Papirium scribit, ad ovum afferet. Qua sobrietate vitam ad senectutem usque, id
 15 est, ad quartum et sexagesimum annum perduxit perduxissetque amplius nisi indigna illa vis ac scelestas in rem publicam triumvirum conspiratio eum ante tempus extinxisset, scilicet Octaviani, Marci Antonii et Lepidi, qui ad ipsius mortem conspiravere. Adeo vero brevissimus somnis fuit, ut quies illa foret longissima quae tribus horis contineretur. Profuit tamen
 20 illi plurimum moderatus quidam motus corporis membrorumque exercitatio.

Quid de moribus eius dicam, in quo tanta tum facilitas animi in omnes, tum liberalitas in suos cives, prudentia in consiliis, constantia in agendo, modestia in rebus secundis, caritas in rem publicam eminebat, ut omnes paene cives a quibus nobilitate opibusque vincebatur, his tot ac

3 in] et T 4 sive] vero T 5 tanto] toto T 11 leviolem] leniorem
 T 13 Fam. 9.20 15 id est] idem T

tantis virtutibus facile anteiret. Declarant hoc summi honores,
 magistratus, dignitates, quas sine labore per omnes gradus consecutus fuit.
 Nemini domus sua clausa extitit. Sive in convivio sive forte in cubiculo
 foret, omnibus libere ad eum accessus patebat. Non passus est quenquam ex
 5 numero civium aut forensis industriae causa aut cuiusque prorsus vel
 laboris vel officii ne minime quidem pecuniam aut exiguum munus ad se
 deferre. Eius in curia sententiae sapientissimae habebantur. Quaecunque
 recta honestaque semel probaverat, nulla ex parte mutata sententia etiam
 cum summo periculo, si rei publicae conducere videbat, tuebatur. Tantum
 10 rem publicam dilexit ut nullam unquam vitae dimicationem pro communi salute
 omnium defugerit. Nemo laudibus aliorum facilius favit. Nemo de studiis
 suis sensit humiliter, et cum tanta de illo apud omnes opinio eloquentiae
 esset ut vel Demostheni anteponeretur, nihil tamen de se arroganter, nihil
 superbe aut scripsit unquam aut elocutus est. Illud enim videbat, eum qui
 15 virtuti suae confideret, minime virtuti alienae invidere, nec tam sua de se
 aut aliorum praedicatione quam de rebus ipsis veram gloriam constare. Dies
 me deficeret, si omnes vel ingenii vel virtutis eius laudes prosequi verbis
 vellem.

Revertor ad eius gesta. Cum ergo adulescens sub Lucio Sulla
 20 Marsico bello meruisset defendissetque egregia illa pro Sexto Roscio
 oratione contra voluntatem Sullae, qui tunc summa rerum potiebatur, eundem
 Roscium, potentiam Sullae veritus Athenas sub simulatione adversae
 valitudinis migravit, ubi ad corroborandum corpus cum se magistris
 gymnasiorum tradidisset, dehinc vocem, quae paulo durior quam oratori

competat in eo erat, ad dulcem sonum suavissimumque revocavit. Antiochum Ascalonium, virum in dicendo et copiosum et suavem studiose audivit, cuius sapientiam admiratus omnem aetatem in studio philosophiae consumere statuerat. Sed mortuo Lucio Sulla frequentibus amicorum litteris ac
 5 nuntiis sollicitatus ut in patriam rediret gravissimisque Antiochi persuasionibus commotus, omisso philosophiae proposito victus sententiam mutavit.

Sed cum in omni libera civitate, tum Romae inprimis dominari eloquentiam expertus esset, non prius ad suos reverti instituit quam bene
 10 graviterque omnes dicendi summos magistros audisset, et ex uno quoque quod optimum imitatu visum ei fuisset perceptum atque auctum secum in Italiam transferret. Hoc primum Athenis, dehinc in Asia, postremo Rhodi, celeriter consecutus, Xenoclem Adramyttenum, Dionisium Magnesium, et Menippum Carem in Asia, Rhodi vero Apollonium illis temporibus summum tradendae
 15 eloquentiae praeceptorem diligentissime audivit. A quo rogatus, erat enim iam non tenuis de eloquentia Ciceronis apud Graecos opinio, ut quoniam latine Apollonius nesciret graece vellet Cicero publice declamare. Talis viri auctoritatem ac desiderium negligendum a se non putavit, qui cum iam non minus graecis quam latinis litteris polleret, tanta omnium admiratione
 20 graece declamavit ut nemo ex astantibus fuit qui non dico laudare satis sed admirari eloquentiam eius possit. Ferunt autem Apollonium, cum omnes iudicium eius expectarent, pro stupore aliquandiu tacuisse dehinc dixisse, "Ego te laudo equidem et admiror, Cicero, sed non possum non angere dolore ac paene confici, quod illud unum quo solo Romani a Graecis adhuc vincebantur,

11 auctum scripsi iustum T auctum V 15 A quo rogatus] ad rogatus V
 21 eloquentiam scripsi eloquentia TV 24 adhuc om. V

doctrinam scilicet et gloriam eloquentiae, a te in Italiam transferri et
 spoliari Graeciam video, quae cunctas nationes omnibus paene rebus sed
 maxime disciplinis longe facileque olim excedebat."

Postea ergo quam Cicero tot instructus artibus et disciplinis

5 navigare in Italiam statuit, quo ad rempublicam regendam ornatior
 accederet, prius oraculum Delphici Apollinis consuluit, quibus rebus ad
 summam gloriam perveniret. A quo responso hoc accepto, posse id quod
 appetebat consequi si non ad vulgi opinionem, sed ad suam naturam omnia
 eius studia revocasset, abstinere ab omni civili potentia et a
 10 magistratibus decrevit. Quod minime ubi Romam < > pervenitque ei per
 amicos suos licuit, assiduis quorum accusationibus increpationibus etiam,
 intermisso potius quam omisso philosophiae proposito, primum coepit, qui ad
 benevolentiam populi Romani proximus gradus est, causas forenses agere,
 nemini patriocinium suum negare, ab accusationibus abstinere. Cumque nihil
 15 unquam avare semperque se apud cives in foro, in campo, in omni denique
 tempore, loco, actione, liberaliter sine praemiis se gereret, tantam populi
 Romani benevolentiam nactus est ut primo quaesturam Siciliae, dehinc
 aedilitatem, tertio praeturam, quarto consulatum cunctis suffragiis ac
 summo populi Romani studio, patriciis saepe ac nobilissimis civibus
 20 repudiatis, adeptus sit.

Praetereo hoc loco quae pro re publica suo in illo consulatu contra
 Catilinam ceterosque coniuratos gesserit, quot hominum in se odia
 insidiasque concitaverit, quod factione inimicorum in exilium compulsus

2 cunctas] contra T 6 accedat V 9 a om. T 10 lacunam statui
 11 suos om. T 19 summo om. T Romani populi studiis T 22 se om. V

sit. Nota ista sunt et illustribus eloquentissimorum virorum monumentis litterarum celebrata. Qua summa dignitate perfunctus multo maior venerabiliorque apud patres conscriptos haberi coepit.

Augur mortuo Grasso factus est. Proconsul Ciliciam obtinuit, in qua se integerrime et castissime gessit, superiorum magistratuum decreta correxit. Civitates egentes et acerbissimis tributis afflictas relevavit. Infinitas pecunias male acceptas restitui his a quibus ablatae erant coegit. Nemo eo proconsule aut virgis caesus aut ullo a se maledicto aut iracundia lacessitus est.

Res autem armis gestae ab illo magnae ac magnificae fuerunt. Nam cum Parthi se provinciam invasuros minarentur, non solum consilio ac virtute omnia paravit quae resistendum Parthis a forti et circumspecto imperatore providenda videbantur, sed pro salute etiam sociorum et finitimorum invigilavit, Ariobazanemque regem Cappodociae incolumem cum suo regno servavit. Amanum oppidum fortissimum caput eius gentis tripartito exercitu magna caede hostium facta expugnavit. Complura alia castella per vim cepit. Dehinc Pindenissum urbem altissimo loco positam aggressus subita obsdione compulsis intra moenia civibus clausit, omnique tormentorum genere aggeribus, vineis, turribus, expugnando septimo et quinquagesimo die quo obsideri coepta est, potitus ea civitate est. Quibus rebus strenue ac fortissime gestis ab exercitu imperator appellatus est. Triumphus redeunti est oblatus, sed quoniam rumor iam de bello civili inter Caesarem et Pompeium divulgabatur, tempus illud minime triumpho accomodatum intellexit et qua sapientia erat illud providit multo maiorem esse gloriam mereri quam

ducere triumphum.

Bello itaque civili iam orto, statuit nullo pacto se armis implicare neque ullas partes sequi abstinuissetque nisi tandem pudore victus ac multorum calumniis et accusationibus quod non sequeretur eum, 5 quem senatus, quem res publica sibi praefecerat, vidissetque honestius sibi esse partes Pompeii sequi quam opinioni hominum et expectationi non satisfacere. Movebat praeterea eum plurimum quorundam hominum partim inimicorum, partim invidorum susurratio. Secutus itaque illo tempore paene extremo Pompeium fuit. Quo paulo post decertatum inter partes in campis 10 Pharsalicis extitit Pompeiusque a Caesare superatus, cui bello minime Cicero interfuit, cum forte eo tempore Dyrrachii valitudine adversa teneretur. Non multo post cognita Caesaris victoria Marcus Cato, qui classi maritimae praeerat et exercitum Ciceroni tradere voluit, eumque in locum Pompeii, quod nullus ibi alius erat qui consularis sufficeret, 15 inprimisque Pompeii magni filius ceterique Ciceronem sibi ducem deposcebant. Qui cum desperandum omnino de victoria manifeste cognosceret, vidit sapientis esse non se rebus illis implicare quas susceptas perducere ad eum quem optaret exitum non posset.

Brundisium itaque navigavit ubi praestolari Caesarem bello tum 20 Alexandrino occupatum decrevit. Audito reditu Caesaris obviam eo Brindisio Tarentum versus processit, quo Caesar applicuerat. Tantum sibi de clementia et moribus Caesaris persuaserat. Caesar vero ut ad se Ciceronem venientem prospexit, subito e navi descendit eique obviam procedens illumque humanissime complexus multa ambulando stadia cum eo remotis

omnibus arbitris confecit. Multa de re publica stabilienda ac resarcienda cum Cicerone commentatus est seque inprimis velut belli civilis initio ad eum scripserat. Consilio Ciceronis in administranda re publica uti velle dixit eumque iussit laureatos fasces, quos ante bellum civile ad illud
 5 usque tempus gesserat, retinere. Cum Cicero gratias agens animo Caesaris uti se malle dixit quam beneficio satisque in re publica et imperio orbis terrarum gubernando uno imperatore esse. Nam et bello civili iam incohato litteris omnibus quas Caesar ad eum scribebat semper hac ad Ciceronem salutatione utebatur. Caesar imperator Ciceroni imperatori salutem.

10 Prosecutus itaque Caesarem ad urbem usquequo Cicero fuit. Sed cum partim victoriae, quae insolentes homines facere consuevit, partim hominum sibi familiarium persuasionibus assiduis, animus Caesaris immutatus minus ac minus in dies consilio Ciceronis utebatur. Novos senatores homines plerosque ignaros, prout quisque magis furori suo in bello civili faverat,
 15 in locum eorum qui pro patria, qui pro libertate pugnando in acie Pharsalica ceciderant sufficiebat. Nihil more maiorum in curia vel in foro gerebatur. Quod ubi Cicero intellexit in otium se contulit, nec ad urbem veniebat nisi gravi ac magna causa impulsus velut pro Marco Marcello, pro Quinto Ligario, pro rege Deiotaro, orationibus illis praeclarissimis, quas
 20 apud Caesarem pro his habuit, iudicare facile possumus. Reliquum tempus omne aut legendo aut cum hominibus ac ei familiaribus disputando aut disputationes illas partim veras, partim quo plus auctoritatis eis inesset vel voluptatis ab eo confectas litteris mandando consumebat.

Postea vero quam conspiratum in mortem Caesaris est ac res publica

in sede maiorum constituta Cicero in urbem rediit. Legem obnoxiam de iniuriarum oblivione tulit dumtaxat huic rei intentus ut cives quos discordia bello civili orta distraxerat concordia uniret firmissimaque pax ac perpetua eos inter se conciliaret. Verum cum improborum audacia in
 5 evertenda re publica plusquam ratio posset, statim perturbari omnia atque everti coepta sunt.

Marco quidem Antonio consule, qui ad illud usque tempus sentire optime pro comuni omnium salute, pro libertate simulaverat, donec statum eius adversus rem publicam stabilisset confirmassetque, primum dare
 10 incoepit operam ut Cassius et duo Bruti principes coniurationis in Caesarem urbe cederent, dehinc omnia per vim decernens cum nihil non apud eum venale esset, armatus in senatum veniebat, quo metu patres compulsi nihil decernere libere, nihil statuere poterant. Quo tempore Cicero non se posse sine periculo versari in senatu videns, quod imperante Caesare
 15 factitaverat, ad pristinum philosophiae studium rediit totumque ferme tempus suum in scribendo aut disputando aut legendo consumebat. Hoc eodem tempore libros officiorum tres ad Marcum filium, qui tum Athenis Cratippum nobilem peripateticum audiebat, conscripsit, quos in praesentia commentandos in manus sumpsimus, eo genere orationis ut neque gravius neque
 20 accuratius legi quicquam possit.

Cumque ne sibi locum in Italia esse ullum videret, legatione ab Antonio impetrata, proficisci in Graeciam statuerat, et una cum filio Athenis esse. Qui delatus in Siciliam et vento ad Leucopetram perductus litteras ab amicis accepit mutatum animum Antonii esse ad rei publicae

salutem conversum, proinde reditum suum in urbem non differret. Neque
 solum hoc amicorum litteris sed etiam senatus cum intelligeret, in urbem
 summa cum festinatione reversus est. Quae res magnopere animum Antonii
 perturbavit. Hinc prima orta est mortis Ciceronis causa. Hoc principium,
 5 hic fons omnium malorum in quae Cicero incidit.

Nam dum Antonius viam sibi ad principatum urbis, id est, ad
 tyrannidem Romani populi ignominiosam affectat, milites armatos inter
 subsellia patrum collocat. Quo patres conscriptos eo paene die, quo Cicero
 ad urbem applicuerat, in curiam cogente, occasionem quaerens aliquam
 10 desaeveniendi in Ciceronem, primum eum absentem non solum acerrimis verbis,
 verum maledictis etiam et contumeliis accusat quod in senatum non venerat,
 minatur insuper se domum eius cum fabris profecturum et eam eversurum
 funditus. Qua contione a Cicerone accepta et hanc consulis superbiam
 indigne ferens postridie in senatum venit. Orationem de causa profectionis
 15 suae ac reditus, velut extat in Philippicis, insignem habuit. De oratione
 Antonii conquestus est, cum non insolentia aliqua, sed defatigatione
 itineris se in curiam illo die non venisse diceret. Commutatum esse
 Antonii animum ab eo qui praescriptus fuit multis verbis reprehendit.
 Fuerat autem eo die, sive industria et consulto sive aliis maioribus
 20 occupationibus detentus, absens Antonius. Qui ut accepit quibus in eum
 verbis Cicero invectus esset, subito ira atque odio in Ciceronem exarsit
 inimicitiasque ei palam denuntiavit.

Qua re nihil perterritus Cicero perseveravit in urbe esse
 sprexitque omnes eius minas et, qua erat animi constantia, parvifecit. Sed

6 id est] idem T 9 occasionem scripsi occasione TV 16 questus T
 19 sive industria] sine industria V

cum dies tertiusdecimus kalendis octobris venisset, Antonius in senatum multis armis saeptus profectus est orationemque diu meditatam in Ciceronem habuit illo absente. Quo intellecto nisi ab amicis impeditus Cicero esset, responsurus Antonio recta via in curiam proficiscebatur. Videbant equidem
 5 amici Ciceronem ad manifestum interitum ruere.

Hinc Antonius aperte iam undique veteranos convocat, copias instruit, nec iam dubium est quod armis invadere urbem velit. Cicero etiam tanto rei publicae periculo cum nullum contra vim consulis paratum praesidium haberet, animum ad Gaium Octavianum, filium Caesaris adoptivum,
 10 paene adhuc impuberem convertit. Hortatus adolescentem est ut partes rei publicae susciperet. Erat enim is adulescens desideratus a veteranis ceterisque militibus qui sub Caesare meruerant et infensus Antonio propterea quod hereditate Caesaris ac magna pecunia fraudatus ab eo erat et multis insuper conviciis litterisque contumeliosis ab eodem irritatus.
 15 Hunc igitur Cicero ad spem magnam summi honoris ac civilis potentiae excitavit. Qui consilio atque adhortatione Ciceronis incitatus veteranos et primam quartamque legionem deserto Antonio ad se venientes conscripsit. Quo Antonius perterritus consilium quod de invadenda urbe ceperat omisit.

Omnia Ciceronis consilio cum in senatu tum in populo gerebantur.
 20 Nec aliud quicquam Cicero quam de Antonio opprimendo cogitabat. Una ei ad hoc res obstabat quod Hirtilius et Pansa consules in annum proximum designati optime de re publica sentientes nondum consulatum aderant, nec auctoritate publica sine consule geri apte quicquam ac resisti Antonio commode poterat. Excitat et igitur litteris et nuntiis Decium Brutum Cicero, qui forte

3 nisi] ubi V 11 is om. V 13 hereditatem V erat ab eo V 24 et om. T

Mutinae illo tempore erat, ut provinciam confirmaret, Antonio in Galliam proficiscenti resisteret privato consilio.

Nusquam Ciceronis cura studiumve pro re publica cessabat. Per tribunos plebis opera Ciceronis senatus in curiam vocatur. Decernitur ut
 5 legiones qui ab Antonio ad Caesarem iuniorem, quem Gaium Octavianum paulo ante nominavimus, defecerant confirmarentur. Itaque praesidia quae Decius Brutus nulla publica auctoritate conscripserat bene recte facta esse a patribus approbarentur. Iudicatur hostis rei publicae Antonius. Kalendis ianuarii novi consules magistratum ineunt. Octavianus pro praetore
 10 deligitur. Consules cum Octaviano copias adversus Antonium instruunt. Tres exercitus ad liberandum Brutum, qui Mutinae ab Antonio obsidebatur, mittuntur. Non longe a Mutina Pansa Antonio occurrit. Quo in conflictu gravissimo vulnere accepto a Pansa et ex acie subducto, exercitus Antonii superior plane videbatur. Hirtius suis copiis ac recentibus integer bellum
 15 restituit, copias Antonii caedit, legiones eius obtruncat. Antonius cum equitibus suis in fugam revertit, sed victoriam casus nescio quis sive perfidia interceptit. Continebat enim se Octavianus dum haec agerentur intra castra et quasi eventus belli speculator quo se fortuna verteret attendebat. Incerti auctores sunt, sed eventus rei qui postea secutus est
 20 suspicionem hanc in Octavianum conflavit, illum tollendi Hirtii curam operamque dedisse ut solus triplici exercitu et rerum summa potiretur. Antonius cum suis equitibus superato Apennino ad vada qui locus inter Alpes et Apenninum iacet se recepit. Qui ubi insequentem Brutum audivit, spe amissa veste mutata ad Lepidum supplex confugit. A quo homine levissimo

cum susceptus esset et copiis eius, quas re publicae nomine ad salutem civium et defensionem libertatis sibi commissas habebat, auctus bellum renovare incoepit.

Octavianus satagente Lepido famae suae, Ciceronis, quem parentem
 5 appellabat, patriae oblitus in colloquium cum Antonio descendit. Cum quo et Lepido nefario foedere percusso ac turpissima societate inita circa Bononiam, de occupanda patria, de civibus proscribendis quos libertatis defensores propugnatoresque esse intelligebant. Tres hi pariter inter se consultant, quodque in malis frequenter accidere videmus, facile
 10 conveniunt. Cum vero ad Ciceronem proscribendum ventum esset, quem unum ex omnibus Antonius summo studio appetat, Octavianus se id concessurum omnino negavit, quem ab ipsa infantia Cicero usque ad id tempus summo favore persecutus erat aureumque Iunonis partum appellabat. Nefas itaque ac parricidium quoddam Octaviano videbatur adversus eum sentire quem et suae
 15 potentiae auctorem ac patrem appellare consueverat. Cum autem biduum amplius in hac contentione triumviri fuisset instarentque Antonius et Lepidus, Octavianus Lucium Paulum Lepidi fratrem et Lucium Caesarem Antonii avunculum viros integerrimos ac libertatis amatores proscribendos depoposcit sperans, ut creditur, illos tantum facinus non admissuros.
 20 Quibus facile consentientibus victus Octavianus Ciceronem odio Antonii concessit.

O sceleratam nefariamque in rem publicam atque in suos
 conspiracyonem. O inauditam crudelitatem ac caecam hominum perditissimorum
 amentiam. Ille patrem, iste avunculum, is fratrem proscribit. Et cum

8 ii V 11 commissurum T 13 persecutus V [Cic.] Ad Oct. 6
 19 deposcit T

gloriae cupiditate desiderioque regnandi inflammati rapiantur, nec hominum eius aetatis omniumque nationum quae inter fines Romani imperii continentur sententiam execrationemque verentur, nec quid de immanitate, de perfidia, de furore eorum posterius iudicaturi sint cogitant. Omitto Ciceronis

5 admiratores, qui morte eius tot illustribus libris operibusque privati sunt quot illum editurum si longior vita ei data fuisset. Constans enim opinio fuit omnia quae divinitus tantoque ceteribus rebus a se olim scriptis praestantiora quanto maiore otio sapientiaque aetas illa abundasset.

Nihil rei publicae vigiliae Ciceroni profuerunt. Nihil divina illa
10 in discernendis defensoribus patriae praemiis providentia. Nihil his qui pugnando pro patria animam in acie effuderant immortales honores, decreti sempiternae virtutis eorum monumenta opitulata sunt. Urbem triumviri nullo repugnante invadunt. Libertatem, praecipuum Romani populi patrimonium, deripiunt. Tabellam proscriptorum palam non sine maximo
15 rubore civitatis proponunt. Cicero caput proscriptorum cum trecentis fere optimatibus civibus percussoribus obicitur. Quae ubi pater patriae intellexit Cicero, nam se in Tusculanum contulerat, Asturam petit hoc animo ut inde ad Marcum Brutum in Macedonium traiceret. Quintus frater maerore anxius fratrem Ciceronem prosequi instituerat, sed cum non satis pecuniae
20 secum extulisse putaret, a complexu Ciceronis crebro singultu, multo gemitu, infinitis lacrimis divulsus clam in urbem domum rediit, ubi mox proditione servorum cum filio a persecutoribus proscriptorum interficitur, Cicero iterum Asturam proficiscitur, oppidum Campaniae non longe a Tarracina eius iuxta mare posita, ubi navem ingressus Circeios usque

navigavit. Quo ubi applicuit incertum an valitudine taedioque navigandi
 impeditus an quod nondum omnem de Octaviano spem abiecisset, in litus
 descendit. Asturam rediit dubius, ut ferunt, Romamne reverteretur (tantum
 sibi de suis immortalibus meritis in Octavianum promittebat) verumne id
 5 faceret per servos suos ac libertos. Ei non licuit cum persecutoribus
 proscriptorum plena essent itinera. Victus igitur Cicero consilio ac
 pietate suorum tum etiam ratione, quae in eo etsi ad breve tempus impedita,
 mirifice vigeat. Inde in Formianum, quam villam habebat pulcherrimam,
 delatus est certus navigandi.

10 Hoc loco insigne prodigium narratur. Corvi equidem obviam volantes
 ne terrae navem applicaret prohibere videbantur, nec minus eum in villam
 usque prosecuti crebris alarum verberibus rauco vocis sono, quo plerumque
 mala futura hominibus, ut creditur, denuntiant, circa domum strepebant.
 Nec desunt qui dicant unum ipsorum per fenestram ad cubiculum usque
 15 pervenisse et ei quietem cupienti sudarium quo tectus erat faciem rapuisse.
 Quo prodigio familiares eius commoti lectica impositum referebant eum ad
 mare.

Sed o vim fatorum inexsuperabilem, cui neque opibus ullis, neque
 consilio, neque aliqua resisti potest sapientia. Ecce cum haec geruntur,
 20 percussores ab Antonio missi subito adsunt, non inventum in Formiano
 persequuntur, variis itineribus fugam eius investigant. Horum dux
 sceleratus ille parricida Popillius a Cicerone olim in causa parricidii
 summo studio defensus erat. Is tribunus militum sub Antonio sperans rem
 Antonio gratissimam se facturum si Ciceronem occidisset, ultro ab Antonio

3 revocaretur T 4 de suis sibi T in om. V 10 equidem scripsi
 siquidem TV 15 faciem erat T 20 adsunt subito V

impetravit ut ad iugulandum Ciceronem mitteretur, ministerium equidem detestabile et in media etiam barbaria exquisitissimo supplicio rescindendum.

Cicero priusquam appellere ad navem potuisset, undique ab hostibus
 5 circumfunditur. Quod ubi persensit nihil periculo mortis instantis perterritus, suis iubet consistere lecticamque humi reponere. Qui etsi valitudine non mediocri affectus erat, supra vires corporis enixus integer animo ac valens consurgit. Percussoribus obviam ipse procedit, barbam, sive ut mos ei erat, sive, ut ego potius crediderem, eius contactu
 10 constantiae ac virilitatis meminisset, sinistra permulcens iugulum satellitibus feriendum patefecit intrepidus. Satis se vel aetatis vel gloriae vixisse testatum, nec patriae defuisse unquam nec libertate populi Romani, qua sublata nec sibi vitam esse optandam inquit. Recepto itaque ferro nullo nec minimo quidem gemitu cum occideretur edito, non minus
 15 fortiter cecidit quam sapienter constanterque vixerat, cum iam annum quartum ac sexagesimum aetatis suae ageret.

Mandaverat autem Antonius Popillio ut caput Ciceronis, quod saepe in senatu contra eum oraverat, et dextram, quae divinas illas in Antonium Philippicas scripserat, ad se deferret, nec erubuit immanis ille omnium
 20 ferarum genere truculentior Popillius caput illud pilo fixum ad Antonium referre, quo ipse non solum vita ipsa, capite, potiebatur, sed etiam ne culleo insutus in profluentem cum sempiterna infamia deiceretur Cicerone patrono a iudicibus obtinuerat.

Caput itaque Ciceronis pro rostris robori affixum quantas lacrimas,

1 quidem V 8 ipse procedit obviam T 9 ei mos T 14 nec] ve T
 15 fortiter om. T annum om. T 18 senatum T

- quot gemitus excitavit. Nemo tam inhumanus, tam impius, tam crudelis fuit qui non tanti facinoris indignitate vel dolore occulto vel apertis lacrimis testaretur, sed inprimis Roma, civitas nuper caput orbis terrarum, portus regum omnium ac nationum, nunc vero foedissima servitate ac turpissima
- 5 tyrannide oppressa, cum omnes pariter cives nihil metu ac minis Antonii perterriti non aliter ad intuendum caput Ciceronis concurrerent quam olim ad divinam eius eloquentiam confluebant. Alii eum patrem patriae appellabant, alii ducem senatus, alii urbis patronum, alii eum certissimum miserorum profugium defensoremque praedicabant. Quis non palam flevit?
- 10 Quis non crudelitatem Antonii exsecratus est? Quis non in Lepidum, Ciceronis quondam in re publica socium, quis non Octavianum maximis honoribus dignitatibusque a Cicerone ornatum, tres saevissimos tyrannos vel tacitis cogitationibus vel apertis maledictis invectus est?

- Nec dubium est illos etiam ipsos mortis eius auctores post factum
- 15 ipsum doluisse, cum eorum nemo tanti orbis terrarum imperium faceret quod breve atque incertum non ignorabant esse quanti, quod se omnibus hominibus odio atque execrationi in omne tempus et esse et futuros esse intelligebant. Quid animi, ut ab Antonio incipiam, fuisse ei putamus, cum Marci Antonii avi sui meminerat et mortem eius causasque mortis cum morte
- 20 Ciceronis comparabat, cum utriusque mores, studia, caritatem in rem publicam, sententias in senatu cum sapienter tum constanter ac summam cum eloquentia salutem habitas inter se conferebat. Quid denique famam illam immortalemque gloriam dicemus quam Marcus Antonius, a quo monstrum hoc ad tanquam Erinyes quaedam belli civilis traxit originem, apud Ciceronem in

illis suis tribus libris de oratore divinitus scriptis consecutus est. Quae cum ideo a Cicerone et inventa esset et disputata, belua ista ac fera silvestris non ignoraret, ne avi sui, hominis eloquentissimi, fama nomenque interiret, cuius neque ullae orationes scriptae neque monumenta ingenii aliqua extabant, non est credibile. Posteaquam furor ille paulum remissus est, saepe eum gemitum dedisse quod pro his beneficiis ac ceteris meritis gratiam hanc ei rependisset. Octavianum vero penitentiam sui consensus animo eius acerbissimam egisse Tiro, libertus Ciceronis, vir insignis litteraturae, testis est, qui et filium Ciceronis mortuo Antonio in collegam, ut legitur, accepit. Statuas Antonii ex senatus consulto ex omnibus locis delendas concessit saepeque illud in ore de Cicerone habebat, "Eloquens vir Cicero, eloquens fuit, et patriae amantissimus." Lepidus autem, quamquam homo esset levissimus, memor tamen se presentem absentemque et in senatu et apud populum defensum in petitione magistratum, adiutum adversus invidos, ab eo protectum non poterat non dolere atque animo angere quod in mortem talis viri proscriptionemque in gratiam Antonii consensisset.

Sed quid mirum totam urbem in tanto maerore affectam morte Ciceronis fuisse, cum Siculi omnes, cum Sardi, qui se ultro ei in clientelam dederant, cum Gallograeci multique reges ac nationes incredibilem dolorem hoc patrono eorum sublato animo conceperint? Nemo vero ex posteris deinceps fuit qui ingenio praestaret, qui his nostris artibus humanitatis praeditus esset, qui sapiens habitus sit, qui non et mortem eius plerumque luxerit et studiorum suorum iacturam saepe

deploraverit, tanta cum in philosophia tum in eloquentia litterarum
 ornamenta, si explere vitae spatium a natura ei constitutum potuisset, ab
 eo expectabantur. Sed iam huic deplorationi modus sit, cum et illos caedis
 eius auctores apud inferos suae crudelitatis sempiterna supplicia pati et
 5 ab eorum maioribus, qui libertatis defensores acerrimi fuerunt, amarissimis
 contumeliis et maledictis lacerari non sit dubitandum, nosterque maeror aut
 incommodum nulla ex parte vel minui lacrimis vel dolore aliquo levare
 possit.

Explicit de vita et morte Tulli Ciceronis secundum Gasparinum de

10 Pergamo.

l cum] tum V 5 fuerant T 7 minui] minimis T